

ROYAL EXCHANGE ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED A.D. 1790.

FOR SEA, FIRE, LIFE AND ANNUITIES.

CHIEF OFFICE: ROYAL EXCHANGE, LONDON.

FUNDS, £4,000,000. CLAIMS PAID, £38,000,000.

FIRE.

INSURANCES ARE GRANTED AGAINST LOSS OR DAMAGE BY FIRE ON PROPERTY of almost every description, at Moderate Rates.

LIFE.

DEATH DUTY POLICIES—Payment Direct to Revenue Authorities before grant of Probate.

Apply for Full Prospectus to

E. H. HANDCOCK, Secretary.

THE OLDEST & WEALTHIEST EXISTING MORTGAGE INSURANCE OFFICE.

THE LAW GUARANTEE AND TRUST SOCIETY, LIMITED.

SUBSCRIBED CAPITAL - £1,000,000. PAID-UP - £100,000.

FIDELITY GUARANTEES OF ALL KINDS. ADMINISTRATION AND LUNACY BONDS. MORTGAGE, DEBENTURE, LICENSE, AND CONTINGENCY INSURANCE. TRUSTEESHIPS FOR DEBENTURE-HOLDERS, &C.

HEAD OFFICE: 49, Chancery-lane, W.C. | CITY OFFICE: 56, Moorgate-street, E.C.

X IMPORTANT TO SOLICITORS X

In Drawing LEASES or MORTGAGES of
LICENSED PROPERTY
To see that the Insurance Covenants include a policy covering the risk of
LOSS OR FORFEITURE OF THE LICENSE.

Suitable clauses, settled by Counsel, can be obtained on application to
THE LICENSES INSURANCE CORPORATION AND
GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED,
24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Mortgages Guaranteed on Licensed Properties promptly, without
special valuation and at low rates.

ALLIANCE ASSURANCE COMPANY.

Established 1824. Capital, £5,000,000 Sterling.

HEAD OFFICE: BARTHOLOMEW LANE, LONDON.

Chairman: RIGHT HON. LORD ROTHCHILD.

LONDON BRANCHES: 1, ST. JAMES'S ST. S.W.; 3, CHANCERY LANE, W.C.;
NORFOLK ST., STRAND; WIGMORE ST.; 3, MINING LANE, E.C.

LIFE AND FIRE INSURANCES AT MODERATE RATES.

Life Policies free from Restrictions, with Perfect Security and Liberal Bonuses.

Special forms of Policies have been prepared to provide for payment of ESTATE DUTIES.

LEASEHOLD AND SINKING FUND POLICIES.

Full Prospectuses on application.

ROBERT LEWIS, Chief Secretary.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	-	-	-	-	£ 3,000,000
INCOME	-	-	-	-	£ 390,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	-	-	-	-	£1,000,000
BUSINESS IN FORCE	-	-	-	-	£11,700,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society
and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. :- Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Next Bonus as at 31st December, 1901.

OFFICES: 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

VOL. XLII, No. 33.

The Solicitors' Journal and Reporter.

LONDON, JUNE 18, 1898.

* The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and
copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on
the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	565	NEW ORDERS, &c.	573
ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFIT OF FIRE	565	LAW SOCIETIES	573
POLICIES	568	LEGAL NEWS	575
THE LAND TRANSFER RULES	569	COURT PAPERS	577
REVIEWS	570	WINDING UP NOTICES	581
CORRESPONDENCE	570	CREDITORS' NOTICES	582
		BANKRUPT NOTICES	583

Cases Reported this Week.

In the Solicitors' Journal.

Altres v. Altres (Staffordshire Finan-	573
cial Co., Claimants)	573
Bailey v. Watson	572
Clark, Re. Ex parte Schulze	573
Earl of Sefton, Re.	570
Grand Junction Waterworks Co. v. The	571
Hampton Urban District Council	571
Howcroft v. Laycock	572
Reg v. Sharpe and Others (Justices).	572
Ex parte Ellis	572
Toms v. Clacton Urban District Council	572

In the Weekly Reporter.

Attorney-General v. Mayor, &c., of	518
Tynemouth	518
Du Cane and Nettelford's Contract,	523
In re	523
Manchester Brewery Co. (Limited) v.	515
North Cheshire and Manchester	515
Brewery Co. (Limited)	515
Orchard v. Bush	527
Reg. v. Bird and Others. Ex parte	528
Needles	528
Russian Spratt's Patent (Limited).	514
In re. Johnson v. Russian Spratt's	514
Patent (Limited)	514

CURRENT TOPICS.

THE RETIREMENT of Mr. Registrar WARD, well earned as it is, will be a source of much regret to practitioners, as removing from the registrars' office an official whose abundant common-sense, experience, and courtesy have been greatly appreciated. There are few posts in which these qualities are more desirable than in that of a Chancery Registrar, whose duties consist so largely in applying and enforcing requirements which, in the hands of some men of technical bent, are as unchangeable as the laws of the Medes and Persians. As senior registrar, Mr. WARD's influence has been of great value. We believe that he first entered the Chancery Registrar's Office in or about 1853, so that he can count over forty years' service.

MR. JUSTICE BARNES announced in court on Tuesday that in future the court would adjourn at 1.30, and sit from 2.15 to 4.15, in order to suit the convenience of the Trinity Masters. It would seem desirable that this question of the luncheon hour (or portion of hour) should be considered and settled with regard to all the courts, and that at least a full hour should be allowed. The interval is important, not merely for the refreshment of the bench, counsel, and solicitors, but also as affording an opportunity for counsel and solicitors to discuss the work of the afternoon.

WE ARE entirely at one with our correspondents who write to deprecate the practice of revealing in the newspapers the particulars of the gross and net personal estate of testators, and the dispositions contained in their wills. The information given is frequently misleading, and the publication of it often causes great inconvenience and annoyance to relatives. The difficulty is that the practice has now been allowed to exist for so many years that the authorities are likely to be rather shy of interfering with it. Still we think that if a statement were prepared and extensively signed by solicitors, setting forth instances of the evils arising from the publication, and were presented to Sir F. JENKIN by a deputation from the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, something would probably be done to check the practice.

THE LAND CHARGES Bill which has been introduced in the House of Lords by the Lord Chancellor, proposes to deprive judgments of any effect as creating a charge on land, and to substitute a charging order to be obtained by the judgment creditor. Under the Judgments Act, 1864 (27 & 28 Vict. c. 112), no judgment affects any land until the land has been actually delivered in execution by virtue of a writ of *elegit* or other lawful authority, but, subject to this requirement, the lands of a judgment debtor are bound by a registered judgment. Previously to 1888 purchasers were exposed to danger in consequence of the difficulty of ascertaining whether the land had been delivered in execution (*Re Pope*, 17 Q. B. D. 543), but under the Land Charges Registration Act, 1888 (51 & 52 Vict. c. 51), delivery in execution is void as against a purchaser for value unless the writ under which it takes place is for the time being registered under that Act, and the position of purchasers has thus been secured. The present Bill proposes to put judgments as affecting land on an entirely new footing. By clause 3 a judgment, whether obtained before or after the commencement of the Act, is not to operate as a charge on land, or on any interest in land, or on the unpaid purchase-money for any land; and by clause 1, where a judgment has been obtained for the payment of money, the judgment creditor is to be entitled to a charging order charging specified land of the judgment debtor, or a specified interest of the judgment debtor in land, with payment of the money and of interest and costs. The charging order will have the like effect as if it were a mortgage deed validly and effectually made by the debtor, upon which the mortgage money has become due, and with an unconditional power of immediate sale, but is not to prejudice any rights—presumably other than those of the judgment debtor—affecting the land at the date of the order. The charging order will have to be registered under the Act of 1888. Thus the scheme abolishes the sheriff as a means of enforcing judgments against land, and, after the charging order has been obtained, the judgment creditor will realize his judgment as though he were a mortgagee.

THE DECISION OF LINDLEY, M.R., and CHITTY and COLLINS, L.JJ., in *Re The Earl of Sefton* is the strong decision of a strong court. It rests on the view taken by the court of their general jurisdiction, and does not consist—as so many modern decisions do—in a mere construction of an Act of Parliament, or a mere application of the principle of a previously decided case. The matter arose out of the lunacy of the present Earl of SEFTON. He had, prior to the unfortunate accident which affected his mind, created a base fee in certain settled estates, of which he was tenant in tail in remainder expectant on the determination of the life estate of his father, the late earl. Under the will of the late earl, who died last year (the will having been made before the lunacy), the lunatic was entitled to very considerable benefits, upon the condition that he should execute a resettlement of the settled estates. The question was whether the court had jurisdiction to order the committee of the estate of the lunatic to execute such resettlement on his behalf, and whether such jurisdiction, if it existed, ought to be exercised. Both questions have been answered in the affirmative. The general rule upon which the courts have consistently acted is, that the character of a lunatic's property and the rights of his successors ought not to be interfered with: see the judgment of Lord SELBORNE in *Attorney-General v. Marquis of Ailesbury* (12 App. Cas. 672). But there is a supplementary rule that such an interference may take place where this is clearly for the benefit of the lunatic: see *Ex parte Phillips* (19 Ves. 118) and *Oxenden v. Lord Compton* (2 Ves. jun. 69). The cases last referred to do not, however, go so far as the decision in Lord SEFTON's case; that decision, as already pointed out, stands independent of authority. A noticeable feature of the case is that, notwithstanding the consolidation of the law of lunacy effected (or attempted) in the Acts of 1890 and 1891, the court could derive no assistance from those Acts in their endeavour to secure to the lunatic the benefit intended for him by his father's will. The statutory provision which comes nearest to an authority for the order which the court has made is probably section 120 (b) of the Lunacy Act, 1890, which

empowers the court to order the committee to "exercise any power or give any consent required for the exercise of any power where the power is vested in the lunatic for his own benefit, or the power of consent is in the nature of a beneficial interest in the lunatic." This provision the court seems to have considered inapplicable to the present case, unless by unduly straining its construction. However this may be, the decision itself is eminently satisfactory, and is calculated to be a useful authority in similar cases.

IT IS PROVIDED by the County Court Rules that, where a defendant intends to rely upon any statutory defence, he must, five clear days before the hearing, file a statement of his grounds of defence and set forth therein the year, chapter, and section, or short title, of the statute. Does this rule require a defendant who has a defence under the Statute of Frauds to give notice of his defence in order to avail himself of it? This question has been raised time after time in the county courts, and some judges have held that no such notice is necessary, whilst others have refused to allow the Statute of Frauds to be set up in the absence of such notice. It is obviously a matter of the greatest importance that such a question should be settled once for all; but years have passed by without any decision of the High Court on the point—or at least without any decision which has been reported. It has, however, now been settled in the case of *Brutton v. Branson*, which recently came before a Divisional Court composed of WILLS and CHANNELL, JJ. (reported in the *Times* of May 8). The action was on a contract for the sale of goods of over £10 in value, and the defence was that there was no memorandum in writing as required by section 4 of the Sale of Goods Act, 1893, which section now takes the place of section 17 of the Statute of Frauds. No notice of this defence having been given, the question arose whether the defendant could avail himself of it—or, in other words, whether a defence under section 4 of the Sale of Goods Act is a "statutory defence" within the meaning of the rules. Now, a defence must either be a defence at common law or a defence under the provisions of some statute, leaving equitable defences out of the question. To an action on a contract for the sale of goods, it is quite clear that the want of writing is not a defence at common law. What, then, can it be except a statutory defence? We confess that we have never been able to appreciate the difficulty, nor to see how it can be seriously argued that the defence of the Statute of Frauds is not a statutory defence, and that, therefore, notice of such defence need not be given. We are glad, therefore, to find that neither of the learned judges could see any meaning in the expression "statutory defence" if it did not include a defence under the Statute of Frauds, and that they held that notice of such defence must be given under the rules. The matter may now accordingly be considered as settled, and several county courts will have to alter their practice.

THE SUMMONS against a barman employed in the House of Commons for selling liquor without a licence was dismissed. It can hardly be said, however, that the grounds upon which it was dismissed are quite satisfactory. The defendant was clearly guilty within the words of the Licensing Acts, for he was neither licensed himself nor was he the servant of a licensed person, nor is the House of Commons a body which is expressly excepted from the provisions of the Act of 1872. The magistrate at Bow-street dismissed the summons on the ground that the Legislature could not have intended to bring about the absurdities that would be produced by applying the Licensing Acts to the House of Commons. It is submitted that this reasoning is hardly convincing, and probably the persons who have raised the question will not rest until the matter has been brought before the High Court. It must be admitted, however, that the results which any other decision of the magistrate might possibly have led to are too wildly absurd for anything except a comic opera. Thus, the magistrate might make an order declaring all the liquor found in the House to be forfeited. Again, if the Members of Parliament are to be considered the occupiers of the House, everyone of them who is privy or consents to the sale of liquor is liable to all the penalties imposed upon persons for

selling without license. The most startling result, however, might be obtained by applying section 17 of the Act of 1874. By that section a discretion is given to any justice of the peace, if satisfied that liquor is being sold by retail at any place within his jurisdiction, to grant a warrant authorizing a constable to enter such place, by force if necessary, and to search the place and every part thereof for intoxicating liquor, and to remove any liquor found therein. We do not think that any one of the Metropolitan police magistrates would use his discretion to grant such a warrant, but there are many unpaid justices of the peace having jurisdiction in London, and who know but that one of them might be found courageous enough to grant such a warrant. The position of the constable who, in obedience to such a warrant, tried to force his way into the House of Commons and to seize the wine, would hardly be a comfortable one. When judgment was given against the defendant in the famous case of *Stockdale v. Hansard* (4 Jur. 70), a writ of execution was issued to the Sheriff of Middlesex against the defendant's goods. The sheriff obeyed the writ and seized the goods. He was promptly imprisoned by the House of Commons for contempt, and when brought before the Court of Queen's Bench by *habeas corpus*, the judges refused to inquire what was the contempt for which he was committed, or to interfere with the action of the House. This case should be a warning to those answerable for the recent prosecution.

IT HAS for a long time been rather widely recognized that habitual drunkards ought not fairly to be held entirely accountable for their actions. The time, therefore, seems to have come when the liberty of these unfortunate and troublesome persons may be restricted by law for remedial treatment without any shock to public feeling; although there is no tendency to relax the important principle of criminal law that drunkenness is no excuse for crime. Hitherto restraint can only be used provided the drunkard consents in the first instance, but now the Habitual Inebriates Bill, which has recently passed a second reading in the Commons, proposes to restrain him whether he likes it or not. The Bill provides for the establishment of State inebriate reformatories, and for the certifying of inebriate reformatories established by public bodies or by private individuals. The Bill proposes that in one of such places the habitual drunkard may be ordered to be detained for any time not exceeding three years, by a court of assize or of quarter sessions. There are two ways in which it is proposed that this order may be obtained. First, when the drunkard is convicted on indictment of any offence punishable with imprisonment or penal servitude, and is at the trial proved to be a habitual drunkard. The allegation that he is such habitual drunkard must be made in the indictment, but the count containing such allegation is not to be put to the prisoner until he has been found guilty, or pleaded guilty, to the main charge—in the same way that a count is used which charges a prisoner with having been previously convicted. The jury have then to decide whether or not the convicted person is a habitual drunkard. The Bill does not contain any fresh definition of the term "habitual drunkard," but it is defined in the Habitual Drunkards Act, 1879, to mean "a person who, not being amenable to any jurisdiction in lunacy, is, notwithstanding, by reason of habitual intemperate drinking of intoxicating liquor, at times dangerous to himself or herself, or to others, or incapable of managing himself or herself, or his or her affairs." The jury having found the prisoner to be a habitual drunkard, or the prisoner having admitted the fact, he may be ordered to be detained as above stated, either in addition to, or in substitution for, any other sentence. The second way in which an order of detention may be obtained is applicable to those drunkards who have not committed an indictable offence, but who are constantly being charged in the police-courts with drunkenness. It is proposed that where a person is charged with drunkenness, after having been convicted at least three times of drunkenness within the twelve months preceding, he may be sent for trial on indictment, and if convicted on the indictment of the offence, and of being a habitual drunkard, he may be ordered to be detained for any period not exceeding three years in any certified inebriate reformatory that is willing

to receive him. It appears that he cannot be sent to a State reformatory, and what is to happen if a certified reformatory willing to receive him cannot be found is not stated. A court of summary jurisdiction is to be given power to make the order for detention on a fourth conviction for drunkenness within twelve months, with the consent of the accused, or where the accused pleads guilty to the offence and admits being a habitual drunkard, or where the accused is under sixteen years of age and consents to the matter being finally dealt with by the magistrates. The Bill was well received by all parties in the House, and seems likely to become a measure of great public benefit. The procedure, however, is rather in the nature of an innovation. It is not provided that habitual drunkenness is an offence, but still a person may be indicted for being a habitual drunkard. In no other case, apparently, may any matter which is not a crime be thus alleged against a person in an indictment.

THE RECENT decision of a Divisional Court (DAY and LAWRENCE, JJ.) in *Altres v. Altres*, to which attention is called in a letter which we publish elsewhere, shows that the practice sometimes followed of omitting to insert in a deed the address or registered office of a limited company which is a party to the deed will have a disastrous effect in the case of a bill of sale under which a company is the grantee. The statutory form of bill of sale inserts the word "of" after the letters "C. D.," which stand for the name of the grantee, and then there follows a blank for the address and description. In *Altres v. Altres* no notice was taken of the blank, and the grantee under the bill of sale was described simply as "The Staffordshire Financial Co. (Limited)." It was contended that the omission to give the address and description of the grantee was a departure from the statutory form which rendered the bill of sale void, and to this contention the court acceded. The test which is to be applied in ascertaining whether a bill of sale sufficiently complies with the form has been variously stated. According to BRETT, M.R., in *Davis v. Burton* (11 Q. B. D., p. 540), the enactment of section 9 of the Act of 1882, that a bill of sale must be "in accordance with the form in the schedule," means that every bill of sale shall be substantially like the form. Nothing substantial must be subtracted from it, and nothing actually inconsistent must be added to it. In *Ex parte Stanford* (17 Q. B. D., p. 270) it was said by BOWEN, L.J., in delivering the judgment of five members of the Court of Appeal, that the test whether a divergence was substantial was whether it altered the legal effect of the document. But this is not to be treated as a universal test, and it appears to be sufficient that there is a divergence in respect of any matter which is characteristic of the statutory form (*Thomas v. Kelly*, 37 W. R. 353, 13 App. Cas. 506; *Parsons v. Brand*, 38 W. R. 388, 25 Q. B. D. 110). The question is, therefore, whether the address and description of the grantee are characteristic of the statutory form. Our correspondents strongly urge that the decision of the Divisional Court is wrong, and they refer to the practice of describing companies by name only. The practice is by no means universal—indeed we should almost have said it was more usual to add the registered office of a limited company—and, if it were, it could hardly affect the question whether or no the insertion of the address is characteristic of the form. The same rule must apply whoever is the grantee, and in the case of an individual it would clearly not be safe to give only his name, when the statutory form obviously contemplates the addition of his address and description. We hope we are wrong—for the decision is extremely inconvenient—but we rather fear, in spite of our respect for our correspondents' opinion, that *Altres v. Altres* must be treated as one of those hard but not obviously incorrect decisions to which section 9 has given rise.

IN THE CASE of *Toms v. Clacton Urban District Council*, before ROMER, J. (reported elsewhere), the principle that a grantor shall not derogate from his grant was applied to somewhat novel circumstances. This maxim of law, which has been said to be "as well established by authority as it is consonant to reason and common sense" (see *Wheldon v. Burrows*, 25 W. R. 196, 12 Ch. D. 31, at p. 49, per THESIGER, L.J.), is frequently appealed

to in cases of implied grants and reservations of the right to light on the sale of one of two adjoining tenements by the owner of both. The general result of the rule is that the grantor of part of a tenement retains no rights over the part granted (see *Elphinstone on the Interpretation of Deeds*, p. 199). The facts of the above case were a sale by the vendor of part of his tenement to the defendants for a cemetery, they covenanting not to use the land for any other purpose without his consent; letting of a cottage on another part within 100 yards of the first-mentioned part on a weekly tenancy, and action by the tenant to restrain the defendants, under the Burial Act, 1855, s. 9, from using the land for a cemetery within 100 yards of his dwelling-house. It was argued that, if the prohibition of the Act were held to apply in such a case, the express purpose of the vendor's grant might be entirely defeated, and that the effect of the rule that a man shall not derogate from his grant was, as shown by the cases, to prevent, not only the vendor, but anyone claiming through or under him, from invoking the Act for the purpose of restricting the defendants' user of the land: see *Elliot v. North-Eastern Railway Co* (8 W. R. 603, 11 Jb. 604, 1 Johns. & H. 145, 10 H. L. Cas. 333) and *Siddons v. Short* (2 C. P. D. 572, 26 W. R. Dig. 253). The learned judge considered that the action was in substance the vendor's action, and that in bringing it he was trying to derogate from his grant. But he also expressed the opinion that a *bond fide* lessee or occupier, after and with full knowledge of the vendor's grant, could not be in any better position than his own grantor, or acquire a right which his own grantor had not. The action accordingly failed. It will be seen that the question whether costs as between solicitor and client ought to be given under the Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893, on the principle of *Harrop v. Ousell Corporation* (46 W. R. 391; 1898, 1 Ch. 525), was reserved for consideration.

ASSIGNMENT OF THE BENEFIT OF FIRE POLICIES.

WE have received a letter from a correspondent raising the question of the position of a vendor who has sold property under a condition that the purchaser shall have the benefit of the current fire policies. Unless the name of the purchaser has been submitted to the insurance office, and the office has consented to an assignment, it has been suggested to be the result of the recent decisions upon the subject that, if a loss occurs pending completion and the vendor receives the policy-moneys from the office, he will be liable upon completion to allow the purchaser to set-off the amount so received against the purchase-money, and also to refund the amount of the policy-moneys to the office. The result, therefore, of a provision which is intended to save the purchaser from the injustice of having to pay in full for property which has been destroyed by fire is to throw the loss upon the vendor and to enable the insurance office, who have been paid for undertaking the risk, to go free. If this correctly represents the law, vendors who assent to the condition in question incur a very grave danger, and our correspondent inquires whether there is any authority that such is really their position.

In the case where the contract of sale is silent as to the fire policies, the law has been settled by the recent decisions of *Rayner v. Preston* (29 W. R. 547, 18 Ch. D. 1) and *Castellain v. Preston* (31 W. R. 557, 11 Q. B. D. 380). As between vendor and purchaser, the risk is upon the latter as from the date of the contract, and, apart from any question of insurance, the full purchase-money must be paid, notwithstanding that the property has been destroyed by fire pending completion. If, however, the benefit of the policy ran with the land, the purchaser would be entitled to any moneys received by the vendor from the insurance office, and this was the view taken by JAMES, L.J., in his dissentient judgment in *Rayner v. Preston*. He based his judgment on two grounds: (1) that after the contract the vendor was a trustee for the purchaser and was bound to hand over to him any benefit derived under the policy; and (2) that it followed from 14 Geo. 3, c. 78, s. 83 (which empowers persons interested in the property to call upon the insurance office to apply the insurance moneys in reinstating it) that the policy enured

for the benefit of all persons interested in the property. But the majority of the court (COTTON and BRETT, L.J.J.) declined to give this effect to the statute, and they declined also to extend the vendor's trusteeship in the manner suggested. "An unpaid vendor," said COTTON, L.J., "is a trustee in a qualified sense only, and is so only because he has made a contract which a court of equity will give effect to by transferring the property sold to the purchaser, and so far as he is a trustee he is so only in respect of the property contracted to be sold. Of this the policy is not a part." But while the majority of the Court of Appeal held that the purchaser was bound to pay the entire purchase-money without any abatement in respect of moneys received from the insurance office, it was suggested that the vendor would not be able to retain such moneys against the office, and the soundness of this suggestion was proved by the subsequent action of *Castellain v. Preston* (*supra*). There it was held that the contract of fire insurance was a contract of indemnity only, and that an insurer who had paid upon a loss was entitled to the benefit of any payments to the insured by which the loss was subsequently diminished. Consequently, since the vendor had received the full amount of the purchase-money and had thus been saved from loss, the insurance office recovered back from him the amount of the policy-moneys which it had paid (see, too, *Darrell v. Tibbits*, 29 W. R. 66, 5 Q. B. D. 560).

The question is, how this right of the insurance office to recover back the policy-moneys is affected by a condition that the purchaser shall have the benefit of them. Usually the policy is granted in such a form as not to be assignable without the consent of the office, and, as already stated, it has been suggested as the result of the decisions that the office is entitled to recover money which it has paid to the vendor, notwithstanding that under this condition he is bound to hand the money over to the purchaser, and in a work of authority this result is treated as probably correct (Dart, *Vendors and Purchasers*, 6th ed., pp. 197, 913). Apparently the idea is that the vendor, on receiving the purchase-money, obtains the full value of the property so as to prevent him from alleging as against the insurance office that he has suffered any loss, and that the office is not concerned with any collateral contract which he has made with regard to the disposal of the insurance moneys. It is possible that a court might adopt this argument and compel the vendor to refund money which he had allowed upon completion to the purchaser, but that such a decision would be given we very much doubt. It is to be noticed that until completion the vendor remains the owner of the property, and in general retains possession of it. He has a right to sue upon the policy: *Collingridge v. Royal Exchange Assurance Corporation* (26 W. R. 112, 3 Q. B. D. 173), and no additional risk is imposed upon the office. So long as he has not been paid by the purchaser, his claim to recover against the office is clear. And when, after recovery of the insurance money, it becomes necessary to inquire whether the vendor has in fact suffered any loss, his contract with the purchaser must be taken as a whole. He is entitled, indeed, under the contract to receive the entire purchase-money, but this is subject to the condition that he shall account to the purchaser for the insurance moneys. It is an incident of the sale that so soon as the moneys come to his hands the purchaser shall have the benefit of them. If the vendor receives them before completion, he allows them to be set off on completion; if afterwards, he forthwith pays them to the purchaser. He only sells the property subject to this liability, and it seems impossible to say that after he has satisfied the liability, and in substance sold the property for a sum representing the difference between the original purchase-money and the amount of the insurance moneys, the office can successfully allege that he has suffered no loss by reason of the fire.

In our view, therefore, it is incorrect to say that the vendor will have to account for the policy moneys to the purchaser and at the same time have to hand them back to the office, but since the question has been raised, it behoves vendors to look upon the condition with suspicion. It is, of course, easy for the purchaser to protect himself otherwise. He can insure the property himself upon the making of the contract, though, having regard to the uncertainty as to whether the contract will be completed,

he may object to incurring this expense. The better course is for application to be at once made to the fire office for consent to an assignment of the policies, and then the purchaser will obtain the benefit of them both before and after completion. Without an assignment the condition in the contract is useless after completion, for the vendor can no longer sue (*Ecclesiastical Commissioners v. Royal Exchange Assurance Corporation*, 39 SOLICITOR'S JOURNAL 623), and the purchaser cannot sue in his own name.

THE LAND TRANSFER RULES.

VI.

Part III.—Registered dealings with registered land.—Transfers of land.—It should be noticed that Part III. is in the draft rules written Part IV. in error. Two forms of instruments of transfer are prescribed (rules 78 and 79), the first where the whole of the land comprised in a title is transferred (Form 13), and the second where part only is transferred (Form 14). There are other forms of instruments of transfer, which we will deal with hereafter. It will be observed that the forms do not contain any acknowledgment of receipt of purchase-money, and that the clumsy provisions under the old rules relating to verification of the signatures to transfers are no longer in force.

A transfer is to be executed as a deed, and to be signed by both transferor and transferee, as in the case of transfers of stock (rules 147 and 148). When a transfer is lodged for registration notice thereof is to be sent to the registered proprietor, unless the execution is admitted by him, and the transfer is not to be registered for three days (rule 152). This again is analogous to the practice of a company which sends a letter to a shareholder before registering a transfer of stock. A transfer is a new assurance of land entirely dependent for its validity and effect upon the statute creating it, and it becomes of the utmost importance, therefore, to determine its effect. First, then, as regards an absolute title, section 30 of the Act of 1875 is as follows:

A transfer for valuable consideration of freehold land registered with an absolute title shall, when registered, confer on the transferee an estate in fee simple in the land transferred, together with all rights, privileges, and appurtenances belonging or appurtenant thereto, subject as follows:

(1) To the incumbrances, if any, entered on the register; and

(2) Unless the contrary is expressed on the register, to such liabilities, rights, and interests, if any, as are by this Act declared not to be incumbrances,

but free from all other estates and interests whatsoever, including estates and interests of Her Majesty.

A duly registered transfer for valuable consideration, which would include marriage, seems to confer a new statutory estate in fee simple on the transferee. The statutory estate so conferred is free from incumbrances, except such (if any) as remain entered on the register at the date of registration of the transfer, and seems to be discharged from all unregistered estates, and from all equities, including, it is conceived, vendor's lien for unpaid purchase-money, not protected by caution, inhibition, or other notice on the register, whether the transferee has extraneous notice thereof or not, but it is subject to certain liabilities which, in the absence of an entry to the contrary on the register, affect all registered land (see Act of 1875, s. 18, as amended by First Schedule to the Act of 1897).

It may, perhaps, be open to question whether a transfer operates to pass the estate of the transferor or creates a new estate. Having regard, however, to the rule that there cannot be two common law fees coexisting in the same land (*Challis's Real Property*, 2nd ed., p. 306), it is conceived that a transfer will be held to vest the legal estate in a transferee for value. If this is not the case, then, inasmuch as a purchaser will require the legal estate for the purpose of unregistered dispositions, the system of registration falls to the ground, as the purchaser will require an abstract of title apart from the register.

As the rights under a transfer of land registered with a possessory title are of greater importance than, and are deter-

mined by reference to, the provisions respecting an absolute title, we will turn at once to section 32 of the Act of 1875, which is as follows:

A transfer for valuable consideration of freehold land registered with a possessory title shall not affect or prejudice the enforcement of any right or interest adverse to or in derogation of the title of the first registered proprietor, and subsisting or capable of arising at the time of the registration of such proprietor; but, save as aforesaid, shall when registered have the same effect as a transfer for valuable consideration of the same land registered with an absolute title.

The effect in the case of a possessory title is the same, therefore, as in the case of an absolute title, except that the transfer does not overreach rights and interests paramount to the fee simple conferred by first registration. On comparing the section last set out with section 8 of the Act of 1875 (*ante*, p. 505) the omission of the word "estate" will be noticed. We conceive, however, that this does not affect the construction. It follows that a purchaser from a proprietor of land registered with a possessory title will require an abstract of title to estates, rights, and interests paramount to the statutory fee simple conferred by first registration. This right is recognized and preserved by section 16 of the Act of 1897. The date of first registration will be disclosed in the case of a possessory title by the land certificate (First Schedule to the Rules, Form 56). Where, therefore, the abstract of title discloses a paramount estate, a purchaser will require a further abstract of title shewing the devolution of the paramount estate after the date of first registration in order that he may be satisfied that it has been got in since the date of first registration. If the person who got in the paramount estate is not the registered proprietor who is selling, the purchaser will at least require it to be shewn that the person who got in the estate was the registered proprietor of the land at the time when the paramount estate was got in. This can only be done by searching the back entries in the register, which the purchaser may now do (rule 212).

If a certificate of registration with a possessory title is not (as it is conceived it should not be) a good commencement of title for the purposes of the Vendor and Purchaser Act, 1874, then, notwithstanding that forty years or more have run since the date of first registration, an abstract of title relating to estates which were paramount at the date of first registration, whether got in or not, must, unless the purchaser contracts himself out of his rights, be furnished to him. It results that in many cases it will be best to keep on foot a title in the usual way off the register, by taking a conveyance in common form as well as a transfer on the register; the purchaser will not only secure for certain the benefit of the Vendor and Purchaser Act, so as only to be liable to produce a forty years' title at most under an open contract, but will also avoid any doubt as to the sufficiency of the prescribed form of transfer for passing any estate or interest got in by the registered proprietor off the register.

In addition, it should be observed that the general words given in section 30, set out above, do not correspond with those implied under section 6 of the Conveyancing and Law of Property Act, 1881. The principal operative words in that section are "reputed or known as . . . parcel of . . . the land." These words do not occur in section 30, so that a doubt will arise whether reputed rights and easements pass under a registered transfer.

When the man in the street is told that, at any rate until judicial decisions have set the doubts on the Act of 1875 at rest, even after he has registered his land, abstracts of title and conveyances on sale will go on merrily just as at present, with the addition of registration, he may feel that the time has arrived for an attempt to be made to express the intention of that Act in terms sufficiently technical and accurate to be acted on by the profession.

The Berlin correspondent of the *Times* announces the death of Professor Julius Baron, Professor of Roman Law in the University of Bonn. Professor Baron was the author of numerous works on Roman law. After having been attached for twenty years to the University of Berlin, he occupied in succession the chairs of Roman law in the universities of Greifswald, Berne, and Bonn. He was in his sixty-fifth year.

REVIEWS.

STATUTE LAW.

GIBSON AND WELDON'S STUDENT'S STATUTE LAW. BEING SPECIALLY INTENDED FOR THE USE OF CANDIDATES AT THE FINAL AND HONOURS EXAMINATIONS OF THE LAW SOCIETY. THIRD EDITION. By the Authors. The "Law Notes" Publishing Offices, 25 and 26, Chancery-lane, W.C.

The activity of the Legislature has compelled Messrs. Gibson and Weldon to make considerable changes in this useful compilation; and, in order to secure room for new statutes, such as the Sale of Goods Act, 1893, and the Trustees Act, 1893, statutes of less general interest or suitable rather for special treatment have been excluded. The present volume accordingly omits the subjects of company law, county courts, ecclesiastical law, inclosure of commons, and shipping law. The chief statute under the last head is the Merchant Shipping Act, 1894, and, from the student's point of view, this Act, with its 748 sections, is well out of the way. The treatment of the statutes which have been included is marked by great thoroughness—thoroughness in some cases, we should have thought, almost beyond the needs of the student, though it gives the volume a greater chance of serving as a compendium for the practising lawyer. The Agricultural Holdings Act, 1883, is an Act to which specially detailed consideration has been given. The statutes are grouped under headings according to their subjects, and the subjects are arranged in alphabetical order. Headings which contain collections of statutes of special importance are "Conveyancing and Law of Property," "Inland Revenue," "Landlord and Tenant," and "Trustees." As a guide to statute law the student will find the book ample for his requirements, and to the practitioner it will serve as a handy book of reference.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Ruling Cases. Arranged, Annotated, and Edited by ROBERT CAMPBELL, M.A., Barrister-at-Law, Advocate of the Scotch Bar, and late Fellow of Trinity Hall, Cambridge; assisted by other Members of the Bar. With American Notes by IRVING BROWNE. Vol. XV.: Judge—Landlord and Tenant. Stevens & Sons (Limited). Price 25s. net.

The Law Relating to the Administration of Charities under the Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853-1894, and Local Government Act, 1894. By THOMAS BOURCHIER-CHILCOTT, Barrister-at-Law. Stevens & Haynes.

A Handy Book on the Law of Master and Servant, Employer and Employed, chiefly as Regards their Civil Rights. By JAMES WALTER SMITH, Esq., LL.D., Barrister-at-Law. New Edition. By GEORGE FREDERICK EMERY, Esq., LL.M., Barrister-at-Law. Effingham Wilson.

Gibson and Weldon's Aid to Equity. Intended as a Guide to that difficult but essential work, Snell's Principles of Equity (12th edition). Sixth Edition. By the Authors. The "Law Notes" Publishing Offices.

CORRESPONDENCE.

PARTICULARS OF TESTATORS' DISPOSITIONS.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—It has been for a long time now the practice for the proprietors of newspapers to obtain from the Probate Court and publish particulars of the dispositions made by testators, and it has now assumed such proportions that we think it is time to consider whether it should be allowed to continue.

We all know that if there is one thing more than another that clients desire it is privacy, and it seems to us to be very wrong that in order to gratify public curiosity the papers should have the liberty of extracting from the office where wills are proved, and publishing to the world, information relating to the most private affairs of life. We have known cases where the utmost pain has been caused, and actually in a recent case under our notice a paper commented on the legal effect of certain bequests (about which there was not, and would not be, any litigation or question), saying (from a garbled extract from the will) that it ought to have said so-and-so. That report was copied into numberless other papers verbatim, and so was published over and over again all over the counties in which the testator was known, and to such an extent that it was quite impossible to have it corrected, and has caused much annoyance and pain to relatives.

It is easy to suggest a remedy for all this, if what we call attention to is known in legal circles to be an evil that ought to be checked,

and we shall be glad to know what is the feeling of yourself and the profession on the subject.

P. & J. WATSON.

Bury, Lancashire, June 10.

[See "Current Topics."—ED. S. J.]

BILL OF SALE TO LIMITED COMPANY.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal.]

Sir,—Permit us to call attention to the decision last week of a Divisional Court (Day and Lawrance, JJ.) in a case of *Altree v. Altree*; in which it was held, on appeal from a county court, that a bill of sale in favour of a limited company was void, as not being in accordance with the statutory form, because the company was described by its corporate name only, without any statement of its office or place of business.

We think this decision, if upheld, must invalidate the great majority of bills of sale given to joint-stock companies, as the general practice of conveyancers is to describe such companies by name only, and, so far as our experience goes, it has never hitherto been supposed that any further description is required when they happen to be grantees under a bill of sale.

For our own part we are satisfied that, both on principle and on authority, the decision is wrong, and we are strongly urged by counsel to appeal further; but unfortunately the court would only give permission on condition of our paying in any event the costs of both sides, and, as these could easily be made to amount to more than the sum at stake, we are practically compelled to submit to what we feel to be an erroneous and mischievous decision.

June 13.

CLAIMANTS' SOLICITORS.

[See "Current Topics."—ED. S. J.]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

Lunacy.

Re THE EARL OF SEFTON. C. A. No. 2. 14th June.

LUNATIC—DIRECTING COMMITTEE TO ELECT TO ACCEPT A DEVISE TO LUNATIC UPON CONDITION OF RESETTLING OTHER PROPERTY—JURISDICTION OF COURT—BENEFIT OF LUNATIC—FECUNDARY BENEFIT—STAT. PREROGATIVA REGIS (17 E. 2, STAT. 1.) C. 10—LUNACY ACT, 1890 (53 & 54 VICT. C. 5).

In this case a devise of land had been made to the lunatic on the condition that within a year after the death of the devisor the devisee should execute a resettlement of certain family estates; and the question now to be decided was whether the court had jurisdiction to direct the committee of the lunatic to elect on behalf of the lunatic to accept the devise and to execute the resettlement. The Earl of Sefton had become a lunatic in consequence of a serious accident which he sustained, and was not likely to live long. His father, the previous Earl of Sefton, who died in June, 1897, was tenant for life of settled estates producing a net rental of about £30,000 a year, and was also absolute owner of estates producing about £21,000 a year. The present earl had, before he became a lunatic, and before his father's death, barred the entail, but without the consent of his father as the protector of the settlement, and had therefore acquired only a base fee. By his will the late earl gave his unsettled estates, subject to a term of 1,000 years given to trustees for certain purposes, to the present earl for life, with remainder to his issue in tail male; and then for similar estates to a younger son of the late earl and his issue, with remainders over. The will directed that every person who should thereunder become entitled (subject to the term of 1,000 years) as tenant for life or tenant in tail male by purchase to the possession of the devised estates, and who should also become entitled as tenant in tail male or in tail, whether by purchase or descent, to the possession of the settled estates should, within one year after becoming so entitled under both the will and the settlement (or, if he was an infant, within a year after attaining twenty-one), disentail the settled estates and resettle them on the same trusts as the devised estates. If the person so becoming entitled did not do this, the estate devised to him was to cease and determine. The testator also bequeathed a sum of £10,000 to the present earl if he should execute the resettlement, and directed that in that event the present earl's debts (which were stated to amount to £31,000) should be paid by the executors. Some of the next-of-kin of the present earl took out a summons asking that the committee might be directed to execute, in the name of the lunatic and on his behalf, a resettlement in accordance with the testator's will. The Master refused the application, which was then made to the Lords Justices in Lunacy. It was opposed by the present earl's next younger brother, who would be a loser if it were successful.

THE COURT (LINDLEY, M.R., and CHITTY and COLLINS, L.JJ.) granted the application.

LINDLEY, M.R., said: I do not think we are in a position to do what we should have liked to do—take a little more time to consider this case. Time presses. If this election is to be made at all, it must be made practically at once; and, having had an opportunity of considering the matter, I have come to a tolerable clear opinion that we have jurisdiction to make this order, and that we ought to exercise that jurisdiction. I will not go through the whole of this very long will. In substance the case stands

self and
ATSON.

ek of a
tree v.
t, that a
being in
ny was
nt of its

the great
as the
panies
s never
required

and on
rged by
uld only
he costs
to more
bmit to

ITORS.

LUNATIC
CTION OF
ROGATIVA
54 VICT.

the conse
tion should
now the com-
the devise
become a
and was
who died
net rental
ates pro-
became a
about the
therefore
unsettled
for certain
ne in tail
the earl and
erson who
years) as
nt in tail
of the
led under
in a year
resettle
o become
cease and
the present
that event
0) should
resent earl
ected to
ement in
plication,
posed by
if it were

) granted

what we
this case.
ade prac-
matter,
a to make
ill not go
se stands

thus. The court has to consider what ought to be done under the following circumstances. Lord Sefton is unfortunately a lunatic. He is entitled to certain settled estates of considerable value. Then there is a will—the will of his father—which leaves him another large property, called the Sefton estates, on condition that he resettles, and thereby cuts down—not destroys, but only cuts down—his interest in the settled estate. Bearing in mind that under his father's will he gets not only a large estate, but also other benefits—the legacy of £10,000 and the payment of his debts—it is obvious that from one point of view, and that one which the court will take into consideration, it is to his advantage to accept this devise. What, then, ought to be done? If this gentleman is in the least degree likely to live, and is actuated by the feelings by which sons usually are or ought to be actuated, there can be no question that he would accept the Sefton estates on the conditions stated in the will. There are obvious family advantages in so doing. I am not at all prepared to say that it is the duty of the court to look only to the question of the lunatic's pecuniary benefit. It is for his benefit to do what his father wished, and to keep the two estates together. It is in this case for his pecuniary interest, because he will get a great deal more money if he accepts the devise. It is for the benefit of the lunatic that he should perform the condition upon which alone he can obtain, or at least can keep, the Sefton estate. I say keep it rather than get it, because under the will he has got it, and he will lose it if he does not resettle it. Let us look at the matter, first, apart from the Lunacy Act, 1890. I go by steps. Speaking generally, and without reference to the statute *De Prærogative Regis*, I take it that these propositions are elementary and indisputable: first, a lunatic can accept a gift of property, or a bequest or a devise of property; second, a lunatic can accept a gift or legacy upon conditions provided that the gift and those conditions are for his benefit; thirdly, if a lunatic is entitled to property upon conditions, it is the duty of his committee to do all that is necessary to preserve the property by performing the conditions. Authority for the last of these propositions will be found in *Collinson's Lunacy*, vol. i., p. 294: "If any part of the estate be liable to forfeiture, or held upon conditions, it is his (the committee's) duty, if possible, to protect it from the forfeiture, to satisfy the conditions, and, when necessary, to apply to the Chancellor for directions." All that I take to be perfectly settled law. Now, suppose one of the conditions is that the lunatic shall give up some interest in real property to which he is entitled, the general principle just laid down will apply to that case. There is nothing I know of in the statutory law contrary to that view, except the provision in the old statute *De Prærogative*. That Act has been construed in such a way as to prevent the court from selling or mortgaging the estates of lunatics for the purpose of raising money, even when the lunatic was in danger of arrest under a *ca. sa.*, or was in prison. That was rather a narrow construction, perhaps. But the language of the Act is important. The purpose of the enactment is, that if the lunatic recovers what is not required for his maintenance will be handed over to him, and if he dies it will go as his property ought to go. In no way is it to be aliened. The courts have held that they had no power to alien the lunatic's property, even for the lunatic's benefit, the object of the Act being to preserve the property for him or his representatives. But it seems to me that we shall be producing for the first time a still narrower construction, if we say, under the stress of this Act, which was passed for a totally different purpose, that we are incompetent to sanction giving up a small part of the lunatic's real estate for the purpose of saving for him a far larger part of it. I agree it would not do to say that because we think our predecessors made a mistake we are going to construe the Act differently. But I am not disposed to press a narrow construction beyond what is necessary. It seems to me we should be making a very bad precedent if we were to hold that this statute of Edward 2, passed to preserve the property of lunatics, prevented us doing what is for the advantage of the lunatic, even in relation to property, and also in other ways. If, then, we have jurisdiction in the matter, it seems to me it follows as a matter of course, in these circumstances, without invoking the Act of 1890 at all, that we ought to exercise that jurisdiction. I will now say a word or two about the Lunacy Act, 1890. It was very strenuously contended by Mr. Farwell that certain sections in that Act authorized the court to make the order here asked for. I think we should be making a bad precedent if we were to say that. We cannot, I think, bring this case within the language of the Act of 1890 without unduly straining that language; and I base my judgment upon the inherent jurisdiction of the court, which is not bounded by the cases enumerated in that Act. With respect to section 124, of which we heard so much, and which enacts that "the committee of the estate, or such person as the judge approves, shall in the name and on behalf of the lunatic execute and do such assurances and things for giving effect to any order under this Act as the judge directs, and every such assurance and thing shall be valid and effectual, and shall take effect accordingly"—I do not invoke that at all. That section, I think, is put in to supply a possible defect or remove a possible doubt. That view does not, however, prevent the court from doing the very same thing under its general jurisdiction. I look upon that section simply as an enabling clause. I cannot help thinking that we should be doing quite wrong were we to give effect to any contention which cuts down the power of the court in this matter. If the case had been pressed I should have liked to look at some authorities, to make sure that I have not made any mistake. As to the principles upon which I have proceeded I do not feel the slightest doubt. I think this application ought to be granted.

CHITTY and COLLINS, L.J.J., delivered judgment to the same effect.—COUNSELL, FARWELL, Q.C., and W. H. COXON-HARDY; WARRINGTON, Q.C., and ARKLE; P. O. LAWRENCE, Q.C., and SARGANT. SOLICITORS, GADGE, KIRBY, & MILLET; FIELD, ROSECOE, & CO., for GIBBONS & ARKLE, Liverpool.

[Reported by R. C. MACKENZIE, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Chancery Division.

GRAND JUNCTION WATERWORKS CO. v. THE HAMPTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL. Stirling, J. 7th, 8th, and 14th June.

LOCAL AUTHORITY—PROCEEDINGS BEFORE MAGISTRATES—DECLARATION AS TO TITLE—EQUITY JURISDICTION—PUBLIC HEALTH (BUILDING IN STREETS) ACT, 1888, s. 3.

This was an action by the plaintiff company asking for a declaration that they were entitled to erect an engine-house and any other buildings they might think fit upon a piece of land purchased by them at Upper Sunbury-road, Hampton, within the defendants' district, without the consent of the defendants. The plaintiffs were a waterworks company constituted under an Act of 51 Geo. 3, c. 189 and other Acts mentioned in the preamble to their Act of 1852, to supply water to a large district on the western side of London. By the Grand Junction Waterworks Act, 1852, the plaintiffs were empowered to make and maintain certain works therein described. In 1853, under the powers of the Act of 1852, they acquired the piece of land in question at Upper Sunbury-road, and built waterworks thereon. In 1897 the plaintiffs desired to extend their works and to erect an engine-house on the said piece of land in connection with their existing works. A dispute arose between the plaintiffs and the defendants as to whether the plaintiffs could erect an engine-house without the consent of the defendants. At defendants' request copies of the plans and sections of the engine-house were sent to the defendants. On the 20th of October, 1897, the plaintiffs gave the defendants notice that they intended to proceed with the engine-house, and commenced the work. On the 11th of November, 1897, the defendants' clerk wrote to the plaintiffs' solicitors that if the work was proceeded with he was directed to take proceedings against the plaintiffs for contravening the Public Health (Building in Streets) Act, 1888. On the 15th of December, 1897, the plaintiffs gave the defendants notice that they intended to proceed with the building, and they actually did so and spent a considerable sum of money before the writ in this action was issued. On the 7th of March, 1898, the plaintiffs received notice from the defendants that the erection of the building was contrary to section 3 of the Public Health (Building in Streets) Act, 1888, and requesting a discontinuance of the offence. The plaintiffs issued their writ in this action on the 12th of March. On the 15th of March the defendants laid an information before the Middlesex magistrates against the plaintiffs for contravening the Public Health (Building in Streets) Act, 1888, and a summons was issued summoning the plaintiffs to appear before a court of summary jurisdiction. This summons was heard on the 9th of May, and the magistrates decided adversely to the plaintiffs. The magistrates' decision was capable of revision by a Divisional Court and the defendants contended—first, that the Chancery Division had no jurisdiction to make the declaration prayed for in the action; and, secondly, that the court in the exercise of its discretion ought not to make any such declaration, but that the plaintiffs ought to be left to make their defence before the tribunal which was the proper one under the statutes involved to deal with the question.

STIRLING, J.—The question is, ought I to allow this action to go on? The statement of claim and writ simply ask for a declaration, and the form of the action is justified by an appeal to ord. 25, r. 5. The last section of that rule is expressed in the widest terms, but it is contended on the other hand that these wide words must be read with some limitation. It does not seem to me that I am called on to decide whether the words ought to be limited or no. I am not satisfied that in this case there is an entire absence of jurisdiction to give relief. The material authorities seem to me to be three. The first is *Lord Auckland v. Westminster Local Board of Works* (20 W. R. 845, 7 Ch. App. 597). That was a case on the Metropolis Management Amendment Act, 1862, and the Court of Appeal held that the District Board of Works ought to have given an owner of land compensation under section 74 of that Act, and that the threat under section 75 to demolish houses erected on the land was *ultra vires*, and that the Board might accordingly be restrained by the Court of Chancery. This case was criticized by Sir George Jessel sitting as Master of the Rolls in *Kerr v. The Corporation of Preston* (25 W. R. 265, 6 Ch. D. 463), who there refused to grant an injunction to restrain the local authority from taking summary proceedings before the magistrates for the recovery of penalties for an offence against the Public Health Act, 1875. The third case is *Stannard v. Vestry of St. Giles, Camberwell* (30 W. R. 693, 20 Ch. D. 190). That case was a dispute about a drain. The defendants gave notice to the plaintiff that they would enter on his land to reinstate the drain, but abandoned this intention and took proceedings against him before the magistrates. The plaintiff claimed an injunction to restrain both the intended trespass and the proceedings. It was held that as no intention to commit a trespass had been proved or alleged, the plaintiff had not made out his case for an injunction against the trespass, and that being so the court had no jurisdiction to restrain the proceedings before the magistrates. That being the state of the authorities I do not think it would be right for me to say that there is absolutely no jurisdiction in this court to restrain the proceedings before the magistrates. In this case, as in *Stannard's case*, there is no evidence that the local board intend to commit any trespass, and there is therefore no ground for the interference of the court on the footing that the defendants threaten or intend to commit any illegal act. Now, whether or no there be jurisdiction in the court to restrain by injunction in such a case as the present, it seems to me that this power should be exercised with the greatest caution, and I respectfully adopt the words of Jessel, M.R., in *Stannard's case*: "Where the Legislature has pointed out a mode of proceeding before a magistrate it is not, as a

general rule, for another court to interfere to stop that proceeding by injunction." And I desire to add that in conflicts between local bodies and private individuals I think that rule ought to be applied very strictly. I think therefore that in the exercise of the discretion which is vested in the court it ought to be very slow to grant an injunction to restrain proceedings before the magistrate where the Legislature has pointed that out as the proper mode of proceeding. *A fortiori* it will be still less likely to make such a declaration as is asked for in the present case in the absence of special circumstances. That brings me to the question whether upon the materials before me there are any such circumstances shown. In my judgment there are not. It seems to me therefore that this is a case in which the court ought not either to interfere by way of injunction or to make the declaration asked for.—COUNSEL, *Bosanquet, Q.C., Macmorran, Q.C., and R. C. Glen; Jenkins, Q.C., and H. Courthope Munros.* SOLICITORS, *Bircham & Co.; Kent & Son.*

[Reported by J. I. STIRLING, Barrister-at-Law.]

TOMS v. CLACTON URBAN DISTRICT COUNCIL. Romer, J. 8th June.
LOCAL GOVERNMENT—BURIAL—VENDOR AND PURCHASER—BURIAL GROUND—PURCHASE OF LAND BY DISTRICT COUNCIL FOR—ACTION TO RESTRAIN BURYING WITHIN PROHIBITED DISTANCE FROM DWELLING-HOUSE—BURIAL ACT, 1855 (18 & 19 VICT. c. 128), s. 9.

This was an action for an injunction to restrain the defendants from using land in their possession for the purposes of a cemetery, except beyond a radius of 100 yards from the plaintiff's dwelling-house. It appeared that the vendor of the land had sold the fee simple to the defendants for the purposes of a cemetery, and the conveyance contained a covenant by them not to use the land for any other purposes except with the vendor's consent. The plaintiff was the occupier of a small cottage close to the land. This cottage belonged to the vendor, and the plaintiff was in his service as gardener. The tenancy appeared to be a weekly one. By 18 & 19 Vict. c. 128, s. 9, no ground not already used as or appropriated for a cemetery shall be used for burials within the distance of 100 yards from any dwelling-house without the consent of the owner, lessee, or occupier of such dwelling-house. The plaintiff was cross-examined with the object of extracting from him the admission that he was plaintiff in name only, and that the real, although not nominal, plaintiff was his employer, the vendor of the land.

ROMER, J.—I will assume for the purpose of my judgment that the land is subject to the restrictions imposed by the Burial Act, 1852 (15 & 16 Vict. c. 85), and the Burial Act, 1855 (18 & 19 Vict. c. 128), or to analogous restrictions. The vendor granted the land in order that every part of it should be used for the purposes of a cemetery. He then placed his gardener in a cottage near it for the purpose of bringing this action and preventing in effect any of it being so used. There is no doubt that the action in substance is the vendor's action, and the costs of the action will have to be provided by him. Could he then bring an action to prevent its use for the express purpose for which he sold it? That would be derogating from his grant to the defendants. It must be remembered that the defendants are doing nothing illegal. Only they have under the Burial Acts to obtain the statutory consent of the owner to what they are doing. The vendor, therefore, could not bring an action. Could a person in the position of the plaintiff, and acting *bona fide*, do so—that is to say, a lessee or occupier, after and with full knowledge of the vendor's grant and its purpose? Such a person could not be in any better position than his own grantor, or acquire a right which his own grantor had not. In fact the plaintiff is a weekly tenant only of the vendor, and he could give a week's notice to the plaintiff at any time. Other grounds might be stated for dismissing the action. But on the above ground alone the action fails. I dismiss the action with costs.

The defendants asked for costs as between solicitor and client under the Public Authorities Protection Act, 1893, citing *Harrop v. Ouselet Corporation* (46 W. R. 391; 1898, 1 Ch. 525). The plaintiff submitted that the action was not, within the words of section 1, brought against the defendants "for any act done in pursuance or execution or intended execution of any Act of Parliament or of any public duty or authority," the cause of action being one of private right. His lordship reserved his judgment on this point.—COUNSEL, *Levett, Q.C., and C. E. Jones; Neville, Q.C., and Inghen.* SOLICITORS, *Jones & Son, Colchester; Chamberlayne & Short.*

[Reported by J. F. WALEY, Barrister-at-Law.]

High Court—Queen's Bench Division.

BAILEY v. WATSON. Div. Court. 10th June.

COUNTY COURT—ACTION COMMENCED IN HIGH COURT—JUDGMENT AS TO PART OF CLAIM—DISPUTED AMOUNT REMITTED BY REGISTRAR FOR TRIAL TO COUNTY COURT—SCALE ON WHICH COSTS WERE TO BE TAXED—COUNTY COURT ACT, 1888 (51 & 52 VICT. c. 43), s. 65.

This was an appeal of the defendant from the decision of the county court judge of Swansea as to the scale on which certain costs should be taxed. The action was brought in the Swansea Registry of the High Court to recover some £44 and a summons for judgment was taken out under Order XIV. On the hearing of the summons the district registrar made an order that the plaintiff should be at liberty to sign final judgment for £27 18s. 6d. with costs; that the defendant might defend as to £2 0s. 6d. (the remainder of the claim being abandoned), and that the action should be remitted to the Swansea County Court. The defendant paid the £27 18s. 6d. with taxed costs, and ultimately the plaintiff recovered judgment for the disputed balance of £2 0s. 6d. in the county court, and

he claimed that these costs should be taxed upon the scale applicable where the amount recovered was between £20 and £50, on the authority of *Kemble v. Bennett* (1894, 2 Q. B. 329). The registrar held that the costs should be taxed on the scale applicable to where the amount sought to be recovered was between £2 and £5. The county court judge reversed that decision and directed that the costs should be taxed on the higher scale. The defendant appealed.

THE COURT (DAY and LAWRENCE, JJ.) allowed the appeal. In the case of *Kemble v. Bennett* the whole of the action was remitted to the county court although only a portion of the claim was in dispute. There rightly the costs were taxed on the higher scale. In this case judgment in the High Court had been given as to part of the claim, and the only sum sought to be recovered in the county court at all was this sum of £2 0s. 6d. That was the only sum which could be said to have been recovered in the county court and the costs on the scale applicable to the recovery of a sum between £2 and £5 was the scale under which the defendant's costs ought to be taxed.—COUNSEL, *R. O. B. Lane; Villiers Meager.* SOLICITORS, *Riddell, Vaisey, & Smith, for Viner, Leeder, & Morris, Swansea; Richard White, for Laurence Richards, Swansea.*

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

REG. v. SHARPE AND OTHERS (JUSTICES). *Ex parte* ELLIS. Div. Court. 8th June.

LICENSING ACTS—JUSTICES—NOTICE OF APPLICATION FOR ADDITIONAL EXCISE LICENCE—HOUSE BEING UNFINISHED NOTICE AFFIXED TO FLOOR—SUCH NOTICE SUFFICIENT.

In this case a rule for a *mandamus* had been granted calling upon certain justices of Brentford to shew cause why they should not hear and determine an application by H. W. Ellis for licences to sell wine, spirits, and beers. No one was instructed by the justices to shew cause, and Master Mellor read the following *amendavit* filed by two of the said justices, which was as follows: "An application was duly made before us and certain other justices of the Brentford Division, at the adjourned general annual licensing meeting at the Town-hall, Brentford, on the 4th of March last, by Mr. Charles Robinson, solicitor, for Mr. H. W. Ellis, of Clovelly, Lampton-road, Hounslow, wine merchant, for a beer-dealer's additional licence, a spirit-dealer's additional licence, and a wine off-licence, in pursuance of 26 & 27 Vict. c. 33, s. 1; 24 & 25 Vict. c. 21, s. 2; and 23 Vict. c. 27, s. 3. It was proved before us that the said H. W. Ellis had given the necessary notices to the police and to the overseers, and had duly advertised his application in a local newspaper and had properly posted his notices on the door of the church of the district. A preliminary objection was taken by Mr. Lay, solicitor, appearing on behalf of Messrs. Moss Bros., of the Broadway, St. Margaret's, and Mr. Wicks, publican, of the Turk's Head, St. Margaret's, who were opposing the application, that the statutory notice was not complete, as it had not been posted on the door of the house proposed to be licensed, inasmuch as the house was not completed. The parish constable who had posted the notices having proved on oath to the satisfaction of the justices that the notice was affixed to floorboards in the doorway of a building not complete, the justices thereupon found there was no door in fact on which the notice could be posted as directed and required by the statute. Mr. Grain, counsel on behalf of Mr. Ellis, applied to the licensing justices on the adjourned licensed day—viz., the 31st of March, for the justices to re-hear his application on the ground that the justices were mistaken in their decision, and still had full powers to hear Mr. Ellis's application on its merits, but the justices declined to re-open the case, having once decided that the notice was bad." Counsel in support of the rule contended that the justices were mistaken and that the notice affixed to the floorboards in the doorway of the uncompleted building was sufficient to satisfy the statute.

THE COURT (DAY and LAWRENCE, JJ.), made the rule absolute.—COUNSEL, *Grain.* SOLICITOR, *Charles Robinson, Brentford and London.*

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

HOWCROFT v. LAYCOCK. Div. Court. 8th June.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—CABBAGE SEEDS—USUAL TRADE DISCLAIMER OF ANY WARRANTY—SEEDS TURNED OUT TO BE THOSE OF A DIFFERENT KIND OF CABBAGE TO THAT ORDERED—ACTION BY VENDOR.

Appeal by defendant from a judgment of his Honour Judge Lumley Smith, sitting at the County Court, Westminster. The plaintiff had supplied some seeds to the defendant's order. When the seeds sent grew up, they proved to be those of another species of cabbage, and valueless for the purpose for which the purchaser required them. The plaintiff sought to recover the price of the seeds; the defendant counter-claimed for breach of contract. The county court judge held that a disclaimer of warranty at the head of the invoice sent when the seeds were delivered, to the effect that the seller gave no warranty, express or implied, as to description, quality, productiveness, or any other matter connected with the seeds he sent out, that he would not be responsible in any way for the crop, and that, if the purchaser did not accept the seeds on those terms, they were at once to be returned, protected the plaintiff, and he gave judgment in his favour accordingly. No suggestion of fraud was raised.

DAY, J., in giving judgment, said the defendant asked to be supplied with seeds of a kind of cabbage called *Cours Tronchuda*. When the seeds sent grew up, they turned out to be Jersey kale, a species of cabbage tree only suitable for making into walking-sticks. The notice very commonly put at the head of seed merchants' bills that they gave no warranty with the seeds did not entitle the seller to deliver something perfectly different to the thing asked for, and which he undertook to supply. It had been

argued for the plaintiff that, the defendant having accepted the goods, he must pay the agreed price unless he could show that the goods had been warranted and had not come up to the warranty. The custom of the trade might qualify a contract, but it could not destroy it. A rational construction must be put upon the words relied upon. The construction desired by the plaintiff to be established by custom of the trade was unreasonable.

LAWRANCE, J., concurred. Appeal allowed; leave to appeal granted.—COUNSEL, A. T. Lawrence, Q.C., and G. B. Hamilton; Earle. SOLICITORS, G. E. Webb; E. F. & H. Landon.

[Reported by ESKINE REID, Barrister-at-Law.]

ALTREE v. ALTREE (STAFFORDSHIRE FINANCIAL CO., Claimants).
Div. Court. 8th June.

BILL OF SALE—VALIDITY—ADDRESS OF GRANTEE—BILLS OF SALE ACT, 1882 (45 & 46 VICT. c. 43), s. 9.

This was an appeal from a county court, and the question was whether a bill of sale was void by reason of the address of the grantees being omitted. The material words of the bill of exchange were as follows: "This indenture made the 12th day of March, 1898, between John Altree, of Triangle Farm, Chase Town, in the parish of Hammerwich, in the county of Stafford, farmer, hereinafter called 'the borrower,' of the one part, and the Staffordshire Financial Co. (Limited), hereinafter called 'the lenders,' of the other part." Section 9 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, provides that a bill of sale "shall be void unless made in accordance with the form in the schedule." In the form referred to a blank is left for the address of the grantee. The county court judge held that the bill of sale was void. It was contended, on behalf of the appellants, that though it was necessary in a bill of sale to give the address and description of the grantor there was no need to give the address or description of the grantee, and further, that even if an individual grantee had to give an address it was not necessary in the case of a limited liability company, because a company could be identified without an address. The following cases were cited to show that, as long as the variation from the form in the schedule was not a material variation, the bill was not invalidated: *Ex parte Stanford* (17 Q. B. D. 259), *Thomas v. Kelly* (13 App. Cas., at p. 311), *Lindfoot v. Pottlett* (1895, 5 Ch. 825), *Simmons v. Woodward* (1892, App. Cas. 100), *Murray v. Mackenzie* (L. R. 10 C. P. 625), *Maugham v. Sharpe* (34 L. J. C. P. 19), *Parsons v. Brund* (25 Q. B. D. 110), *Simmons v. Trollope* (1897, 1 Q. B. 24), *Dolcini v. Dolcini* (1895, 1 Q. B. 898), *Smith v. Hammond* (1896, 1 Q. B. 571), *Shears v. Jacob* (L. R. 1 C. P. 513). It was contended that the address in the case of a company was mere surplusage inasmuch as it was not required for the purpose of identification. It was also contended that the use of the words "in accordance with" the form, in section 9, instead of the word "in," indicated that all that was required was that the bill should be substantially in the form provided.

THE COURT (DAY and LAWRENCE, JJ.) dismissed the appeal, on the ground that the provision of section 9 of the Bills of Sale Act, 1882, together with the fact that in the form therein referred to a blank was left for the address of the grantee as well as for that of the grantor showed that the address of the grantee should appear in the bill.—COUNSEL, J. B. Matthews; DISTRICT SOLICITORS, Smiles & Co.; L. W. Lewis & Sons, Walsall; Pitman & Sons, for Barnes & Son, Lichfield.

[Reported by C. G. WILBRAHAM, Barrister-at-Law.]

Bankruptcy Cases.

Re CLARK, Ex parte SCHULZE. C. A. 10th June.

BANKRUPTCY—PROOF—LOAN BY WIFE TO HUSBAND—MARRIED WOMEN'S PROPERTY ACT, 1882, s. 3.

This was an appeal from the judgment of Wright, J., holding that the wife of the debtor was entitled to prove against the debtor's estate for money lent by her to her husband. The case turned on the construction to be placed on section 3 of the Married Women's Property Act, 1882, which enacts that "any money or other estate of the wife lent or entrusted by her to her husband for [the purpose of] any trade or business carried on by him, or otherwise, shall be treated as assets of her husband's estate in case of his bankruptcy, under reservation of the wife's claim to a dividend as a creditor for the amount or value of such money or other estate after, but not before, all claims of the other creditors of the husband for valuable consideration in money or money's worth have been satisfied." The money in question was not lent by the wife to her husband for the purpose of his trade or business. The wife's proof was admitted for voting purposes by the chairman at the first meeting of creditors. Wright, J., held that the proof was rightly admitted. One of the creditors appealed.

THE COURT (A. L. SMITH, RIGNY, and VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.JJ.) dismissed the appeal.

A. L. SMITH, L.J., said that the appellant's contention in effect was that whenever a wife lent money to her husband and he became bankrupt her claim must be postponed until all the other creditors had been satisfied. That construction of the section entirely ignored the words, "for the purpose of any trade or business carried on by him, or otherwise." The words "or otherwise" did present a difficulty, but whatever their true meaning might be, it could not be that the limitation as to trade or business was to be cut out. In *Ex parte Tidswell* (35 W. R. 669) Cave, J., had to consider the meaning of the section, and he said: "I guess, rather than conclude, that the draftsman meant to say, 'any money of the wife lent by her to her husband for the purpose of any trade or

business carried on by him, whether alone or in partnership with others, and whether personally or by an agent, &c.,' and that he did not mean to say, 'for the purpose of any trade or business carried on by him, or for the purpose of any other business.'" His lordship did not say whether that suggested interpretation was the correct one, but he agreed with Cave, J.'s decision that the section did not apply when the money was lent by the wife for purposes other than those of the husband's trade or business. It was said that *Ex parte Tidswell* was in conflict with *Re Tuff, Ex parte Nottingham* (35 W. R. 567, 19 Q. B. D. 88), but that was not so, because in the latter case the wife's proof was admitted, not against her husband, but against a firm of which he was a member.

RIGNY and VAUGHAN WILLIAMS, L.JJ., concurred. Appeal dismissed.—COUNSEL, C. A. Russell, Q.C., and Hansell; Upjohn, Q.C., and Frank Mellor. SOLICITORS, F. W. & H. Hilbery; Arnold & Henry White.

[Reported by F. O. ROBINSON, Barrister-at-Law.]

SOLICITORS ORDERED TO BE STRUCK OFF THE ROLLS.

14 JUNE.—RICHARD ARMSTRONG (155, Fenchurch-street, London).

14 JUNE.—WILLIAM NORTH (Pudsey, Yorkshire) [facts to be submitted by solicitor in affidavit to Incorporated Law Society for reconsideration].

NEW ORDERS, &c.

TRANSFER OF ACTIONS.

ORDER OF COURT.

Thursday, the 9th day of June, 1898.

I, Hardinge Stanley, Earl of Halsbury, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, do hereby order that the action mentioned in the Schedule hereto shall be transferred to the Honourable Mr. Justice Wright.

SCHEDULE.

Mr. Justice Romer (1898—T.—No. 530).

In re Thom, Baker & Company Limited
Beatrice Huxtable (Widow) v. Thom, Baker & Company Limited and Harry Maconochie.

LAW SOCIETIES.

SOLICITORS' BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION.

ANNIVERSARY FESTIVAL.

The thirty-eighth anniversary festival of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association was held on Wednesday at the Whitehall Rooms, Hôtel Métropole. Mr. JOSEPH ADDISON taking the chair. Among the guests were Mr. Reginald Brown, Mr. Henry Kneeshaw, J.P., Mr. G. Buckton Browne, M.R.C.S., Mr. W. Allen, M.P., Mr. C. Bill, M.P., Mr. T. Skewes-Cox, M.P., Mr. E. A. Goulding, M.P., Mr. C. J. Blagg (Cheshire), Mr. Sidney Smith, Mr. C. E. Jones, Mr. H. Manisty, Mr. H. Morten Cotton (chairman of Board of Directors), Mr. W. Melmoth Walters, Mr. Henry Power, F.R.C.S., Mr. George P. Allen (Manchester), Mr. B. F. Hawkesley, Mr. C. G. Boxall, C.B., Mr. J. Roger B. Gregory, Mr. Samuel Harris (Leicester), Mr. Alexander Neilson, Mr. Richard W. Tweedie, Mons. Rusteyko, Mr. H. J. Osborne (president Shropshire Law Society), Mr. Thomas Eggar (president Sussex Law Society), Mr. W. C. H. Cross (president Bristol Law Society), Mr. J. Prior, Mr. J. A. C. Tanner, Mr. James Turner, Mr. C. D. Kimber, M.A., Mr. L. F. Cotton, Mr. M. H. Cotton, Mr. S. G. Sprent, Mr. A. J. Vere Bass, Mr. A. S. Massey, Mr. R. S. Taylor, Mr. Joseph Soames, Mr. F. Sheffield, Mr. G. Carrick (Worcester), Mr. N. Goddard Jackson, Mr. M. F. Monier-Williams, Mr. J. W. Howlett (Brighton), Mr. J. W. A. Calkin, Mr. Grantham R. Dodd, Mr. A. E. Timbrell, Mr. Wm. Addison, Mr. H. Bevir (Wootton Bassett), Mr. C. L. Smiles, Mr. W. J. Boycott, Mr. Harry Woodward, Mr. W. B. Harrison, Mr. Archibald Haubury, Mr. G. Roddam Burn, Mr. Roddam W. Burn, Mr. Frank M. Crisp, Mr. J. W. Crisp, Mr. W. J. D. Andrew, Mr. R. H. Purves, Mr. Henry Tyrrell, Mr. H. R. Tyrrell, Mr. G. E. Tyrrell, Mr. A. J. Harris, Mr. J. A. Collins, Mr. Charles Burgin, Mr. E. Lambert Burgin, Mr. W. Howard Gray, Mr. E. Cleave, and Mr. J. E. Stephenson.

The loyal toasts having been given from the chair and duly honoured,

The CHAIRMAN proposed "The Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and may prosperity continue to attend it." He said he was proposing that which was the chief toast of the evening—indeed, it was the real occasion of their meeting, and he thought that this meeting spoke well for the merits of the charity, and for the generous support which it received. The association, in choosing its chairman on such occasions, differed from most societies. With its influence and with its objects, it would have no difficulty in placing in the chair one of great name or of distinguished attainments which might add power to the words he should utter. But it chose one of its own members, thinking—and perhaps wisely—that one who had toiled in the ranks with their comrades who had fallen by the way might be best acquainted with the dangers and difficulties that beset the legal path, and the sad results that awaited upon early death or failure. It might be that to some—he hoped to many—that legal path might have been made smooth by those who had gone before; but to most of them it had not been so, and those of them to whom some measure of success had been accorded, how well they knew the difficulties and dangers

which they had to go through, how easy it was to take the wrong turning, what care was needed, how often that which looked tempting might lead to loss, how often that which had promised brightly had turned out to be an absolute failure. And when they thought of the young beginners who started upon that difficult path, inexperienced, eager to work, anxious perhaps to surround themselves with the comforts of a home, how could they but sympathize when in that struggle something which seemed tempting in business was entered upon and then the result was failure, something which promised them well but had not fulfilled that promise. Even with the best of efforts misfortune came, and came sometimes quite undeserved, and even when there had been no want of care. Then, too, there was the sad failure of health—want of strength to fight the battle of life. Or it might be that silent messenger which came to all, came all untimely to some new home and left, not only the vacant place, but left also wretchedness and want to those who remained. Those who administered this charity knew, as he thought all those who were present knew, that there was no sadder lot in life than that of the widow and family of the young professional man left unprovided for. He had no doubt that the appeals which reached the directors of the association wrung their hearts, and that were their resources many times what they are they would be all insufficient to reach the needs of the deserving applicants for help. He looked back now nearly to forty years when, emerging from his articles, he, with many young friends, looked upon an uncertain future, and it had been one of the pleasures of his life to meet in some corner of the country, in some old town, or it might be in some provincial president coming up year by year to join the Council of the Incorporated Law Society, and to grasp again the hand of those old friends made some thirty years ago, and to find that he had prospered. But there was a note of sadness—success had not been the lot of all one's friends. Some were poor and stricken, and that which had been his experience he knew had been the experience of nearly all who had reached his years. To turn to the object of this society, and the efforts which it made to reach those who were in need: it was founded forty years ago by those whose motives and whose labours entitled them to a just meed of applause at the hands of the profession. It had always grown and prospered. In 1868, ten years after it was founded, there were 1,927 solicitors who were members of the association. In 1878 the number had grown to 2,489. In 1888 there were 3,198 members, and in 1898 there were 3,425 members. There were, however, 16,000 solicitors upon the roll, and he should greatly like to see that number extended. Then, in 1868 all the society was able to grant was £490. In 1878 that had grown to £2,445; in 1888 it had increased to £3,704, and last year the amount was £4,702. These figures, gratifying as they were, were not too large. He was sure it would be the wish of those present that he should tender a word of hearty thanks to their country friends. With all their local burdens, and the many claims upon them, they did most ungrudgingly and liberally support the association. He should like, too—and there he knew he should have their sympathy entirely—to say how much they were indebted to their directors and officers, and those by whom the affairs of the association were carried on. Their directors were among the busiest members of the profession, and they devoted to the work of this charity their time, their energy, their experience in the most ungrudging and unselfish manner. The charity was administered by them as he believed no other body of men could administer the charity of their profession. Their hearts, he had no doubt, were often troubled that they could do no more, but he was sure that those he was addressing would join with him in a hearty expression of gratitude to them all for the kind and excellent work they were doing. He did not expect that this year the usual level attained at this festival as regarded donations and subscriptions would be reached. Last year all ranks laid upon themselves heavy taxes and burdens, and this year he would not be surprised to find that the friends of the association were not able to support it to the extent they had done in other years. But a great debt of gratitude was due to those who had attended the festival to give the association their support. And here, again, he wished to say how much they were indebted to their country friends, many of whom had come with great inconvenience to themselves. And, amongst others, he was sure they would not think him invidious if he mentioned the name of their dear old friend Mr. Howlett as being one of their longest and best supporters. Even when he had been suffering from ill-health he had always thought of the society, and it was a great pleasure to see that he had gained a measure of strength. He (the chairman) trusted that all whom his words reached would, as far as they could, endeavour to induce those who did not already subscribe to the association to become annual subscribers, giving something yearly, however small an amount it might be. Because it was the steady, unfailing income which was derived from subscriptions upon which the directors felt that they could really rely which was the mainstay of the association. It was the fashion to say that we live in a cold and selfish world, but this association and its objects and many similar societies were standing protests against that slander, and he for one declared that throughout all his life he had enjoyed the greatest help and kindness, often unsought and unexpected, and he was sure his lot had been the lot of most of them. And that help and support was in their hearts, he was sure, to-night when they were thinking of the objects of the association. Not alone was it to those upon whom misfortune and sorrow might fall that disappointment came, but with each and all of them many bright hopes failed and many pleasing illusions were dispelled and much which seemed of fair promise turned out an empty show. But there was one light which shone upon our path which would never fail us and that was the light which shone through the good works and kindly purposes they were met to-night to support. It might be when they came to cease from their labours, and looked upon their past, that it would not be the victories they had won or any material success they had

achieved the thought of which would be most pleasant to them, but the occasions when it had been in their power to help some struggling or fallen brother, to bring some help to a stricken home or to those left desolate, and the recollection that of those amongst whom they had lived and laboured there were some, he hoped it might be many, who would bear them in kindly memory.

The toast was drunk upstanding and with enthusiasm.

The SECRETARY (Mr. J. T. Scott) announced subscriptions and donations amounting to £892, amongst which were the following: The Chairman, £105; Mr. H. Morten Cotton (chairman of the Board of Directors), £50; St. Geo. H. Lewis, £50; Mr. J. W. Howlett (Brighton), £50; Mr. C. S. Clarke (Brighton), £25; Mr. W. Melmoth Walters, £21.

Mr. C. J. BLOOM proposed the health of "The Houses of Parliament." He said that there was no question there were some drawbacks in connection with the Houses of Parliament. Outsiders could not help seeing some slight imperfections, just as there were spots upon the sun; but he thought they would all agree that the Houses of Parliament would compare favourably with any representative body in the world, not only because it comprised great talent, not only that it was an assembly of a representative character, but for its generous appreciation of opponents, of which there was an example in the tribute paid by both Houses on the death of a great statesman a few weeks ago. There was another point which among lawyers it was legitimate to mention, and that was that the legal element was particularly strong, as he hoped it always would be, in both Houses of Parliament. History recorded that there was one occasion when a Parliament was tried without any lawyers, but the result of that experiment was well known, and he thought it would never be tried again. As lawyers they were indebted to the parliamentary labours of our legislators, for a part of their business would not exist if it were not for the extreme ingenuity with which the statutes were enacted. If it were not for the puzzles which were set by our legislators a good deal of the business of lawyers would not be; therefore they were in a position to drink the toast. The House of Lords acted as a drag which was occasionally very useful, and there were people sufficiently old-fashioned to say "Thank God we have a House of Lords." The House of Lords was certainly strengthened, and its life was prolonged, by the accession of fresh blood which it continually received from the learned professions, and from the legal profession in particular. But for this he thought there would be a danger of the House of Lords stagnating; but it contained an immense amount of talent and it did an occasional signal service to the country.

Mr. T. SKELLES-COX, M.P., in returning thanks, said that the longer he was in the House of Commons the more he was impressed with the dignity of the House of Lords and the absolute necessity of having a second chamber. With regard to the House of Commons, of which there were three members present, it consisted of 670 members, of whom 139 were barristers, and he regretted to say, only twenty-seven solicitors. This was far too few. If the House of Commons was to pass just, intelligent, and easily construed laws there must be more solicitors as its members.

Mr. H. MANIETT gave the toast, "The Bench and the Bar." He said this was peculiarly appropriate, because as solicitors they knew more about the subject than those whose health he was proposing knew about it themselves. Solicitors were the constant critics of the bench and the bar, and everything they did was done in front of solicitors. He was sorry there was no member of the bench present; but that presented no difficulty, because every member of the bench was a member of the bar, and continued a member of the bar. It was a fortunate thing for the public and for solicitors and for the bar itself that this was so, because every member of the bench knew from his own experience the difficulties which were felt and had to be dealt with by both solicitors and barristers. It was not, as was the case in foreign countries, where a man commenced his career on the bench, and knowing the difficulties, the occupants of the bench refrained from making observations such as one heard of in connection with other countries. The bench and bar would compare with any bench and any bar in the whole world. But they were present as members of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and he should like to say one word upon that point with regard to the bar. The Barristers' Benevolent Association was not so old as this, and he was not sure that its annual income was as large, but they might take a lesson from the bar in individual kindness, individual benevolence, and individual liberality, in which respect solicitors could not compare with the bar. He had been brought up in the atmosphere of the law from his earliest years, and he knew of cases where barristers had individually given their money and time and everything that was required to assist members of their own profession who were in need. He knew of instances where they had given liberally and, outsiders might think, with almost too lavish a hand. Although the Barristers' Benevolent Association was not so old or so wealthy as was the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, more had been done by the bar possibly, until late years, for those in need than by the solicitors' branch. He had the greatest feeling of respect for the liberality of the bar. He had said that every member of the bench was a member of the bar, and every member of the bar carried in his brief bag the possibilities of the bench, and so every member of the bar could respond for the bench.

Mr. REGINALD BROWN, in returning thanks, regretted that, owing to the dinner to the judges at the Mansion House, there was no member of the bench present. He considered the bar a noble and useful profession—it was certainly one of the most enlightened and learned of the professions. Its members possessed great privileges, the privilege of defending those who were in any way oppressed, the privilege of seeing that one's party rights were adjusted in accordance with the laws of the country. It was also a splendid profession in that it opened great possibilities of success to every member. He was afraid there were few who attained to them, but they had the chance of positions of great success both socially and financially. At the same time, although it was a profession meriting that encomium, it was not all *coulour de rose*. The bar did not number, like the solicitors, 16,000

members, but more like 7,000, and of these, of course, only a small proportion, unfortunately, found the profession such a success as they would wish it to be. Hence arose the necessity for a benevolent association, and it was modelled more or less on the lines of the Solicitors' Benevolent Association. As had been rightly said, the Barristers' Benevolent Association was a younger association, and its funds were less, but the necessity for it had been pressed upon the members of the bar. He hoped the two branches of the profession would always stand by one another. He objected to the term "lower" branch, and would prefer to say the other branch of the profession. He believed the motto, "United we stand, divided we fall," might very well be applied to them.

Mr. G. P. ALLEN submitted the health of "The Incorporated and other Law Societies of England and Wales," speaking of the value of the work done by the Incorporated Law Society for the profession throughout the country. That the Incorporated Law Society did a great work he was in a position to assert, because, for one year, he had been an honorary member of the council consequent on his being President of the Manchester Law Society, and he had had the opportunity of seeing what an enormous amount of work the council of the society got through. When they came to consider that the council was composed of gentlemen who were engaged in the most active pursuit of their profession, whose time was most precious, and who, notwithstanding that, gave all the time that was necessary for attending to the interests of the profession generally, they would agree that their services were deserving of all gratitude, as they were of the greatest benefit to practitioners throughout the country. With regard to the law societies of England and Wales generally, they did in the first instance what was right and proper in the interest of the profession generally in their own district. In the second place they had very large committees, the result being that they included, as a rule, the leading practitioners of the district. As a consequence, a bond of fellowship was created which was of very great service not only to themselves, but also to all the practitioners in the district they had to control. When any point of importance arose which required to be decided it was referred to the committee of the society, who dealt with it; and the societies were of very great service to the profession.

Mr. THOMAS EGGAR (president of the Sussex Law Society) returned thanks. He said the provincial law societies were greatly indebted to the Incorporated Law Society for the assistance and encouragement they received from the central authority. He was not sure that the provincial societies did all they could or all they might in the way of reciprocity. He thought they might do a little more sometimes to strengthen the hands of the central authority. When they thought what the Incorporated Law Society did for the profession at large, it was a matter of astonishment that so comparatively small a proportion of the total number of solicitors on the rolls were members. He thought this was a matter that really ought to be remedied, and that they should do more by membership to support and strengthen the hands of the central society. He was afraid they got a little bit slack in the country at all events, by leaving things to be attended to by the council in London. They looked after the interests of the country solicitors very well, but the country solicitors might help them more than they did. He could not sit down without speaking of Mr. Howlett, who was one of the greatest supporters of the Association, and it gave him great gratification that he was restored to health.

The CHAIRMAN gave the health of "The Visitors." He said they had amongst them two distinguished members of that great profession of medicine which was so closely associated with all works of charity, Mr. Hy. Power and Mr. Bukston Browne. He had been puzzling his brains as to which of the great professions, law or medicine, had been the greatest benefit to mankind. Without law and order man would be very little better than a savage, with no protection for home and property, and with no rights. Civilisation, as we understand it, could not exist. He was sure, therefore, that there was no greater blessing to any free nation than righteous law rightly administered. Then, on the other hand, what did we not owe to that great profession of medicine and to the great men who had devoted their lives to it? What a splendid record was theirs of unwearied effort and great result! If they took only the discoveries they had made during the last century—there was that great discovery of anaesthetics, which had saved so much suffering and so many lives. Then there was that other discovery of antiseptic treatment, and, last, that strange discovery of those rays which seemed to search out all hidden secrets of the frame, and enabled surgeons to do what no one had thought possible. He for one thought that if we were to place high in the ranks of fame those conquerors who had brought destruction and death in their train, we ought to place as high in rank those whose labours had given health to the nations. He knew no nobler lot than that of the surgeon and the physician. They knew their labours were heavy and their anxieties many. They had their daily reward in pain and suffering relieved, in health restored, in comfort brought to some troubled home, and he hoped they would believe that not only in this room, but universally, that to the noble profession to which they belonged, and all who laboured in it, unbounded gratitude and thanks were given.

Mr. HY. POWER, F.R.C.S., returned thanks.

Mr. H. MORTON COTTON (chairman of the Board of Directors) proposed the health of "The Chairman." He said that Mr. Addison attained the highest honour in the profession last year when he became president of the Incorporated Law Society. It was an exceptional year, and they had wanted a man to represent them, and they were most worthily represented by Mr. Addison. He had found time to devote himself to a charity which was of the greatest value to the profession—the Victorian Pension Fund. He (Mr. Morton Cotton) had been a little behind the scenes after the council had determined to hand the fund over to the Solicitors' Benevolent Association, and he would assure them that no one could tell the pains Mr. Addison had taken about it. The fund amounted to £8,585, which was a very handsome sum, and notwithstanding that it was raised last year, the funds of the association, which one would have imagined would have suffered, had not

done so, the amount collected in subscriptions in that year had been larger than it had been before. The secretary, Mr. Scott, who was a most able and excellent secretary and gave his heart and soul to the work of the association, came to him and thought they would get very little, and he (Mr. Morton Cotton) was extremely surprised at the amount collected to-night, and tendered his thanks to the generous donors. The trusts of the Victorian Pension Fund were for the profession generally without reference to any particular members. The Solicitors' Benevolent Fund was administered first to those who were its members, and afterwards for the general benefit of the profession. The funds were kept separate, and there was no difficulty whatever in their administration. But there was now the society which the Solicitors' Benevolent Association had for years been trying to get to amalgamate with them, but unfortunately there were difficulties in the way. That society was limited to the relief of necessitous members of the profession in the metropolis and the vicinity. He hoped in time the amalgamation would be brought about, and the funds would be combined, and so be administered with one set of machinery. The cases which came before the directors grieved their hearts. They had invested the Victorian Pension Fund, and it provided an income of £210 a year. This had been divided into six pensions, two of £50 each, two of £25, and two of £20. The directors did all they could to select the most deserving cases, and this involved great trouble and labour. It was most distressing to see the cases that were brought before them.

The toast was drunk upstanding with musical honours and three cheers.

The CHAIRMAN, in acknowledging the compliment, said that he could desire nothing more in his professional career than that he should so pass through it as to be thought to occupy a worthy place in it.

A selection of music was efficiently performed under the direction of Mr. Arthur Thompson, by Miss Bessie Grant, Master Willie Gammage, Mr. Walter Coward, Mr. Albert James, Mr. Arthur Thompson, Mr. Robert Hilton; accompanist, Mr. J. Kiff.

LAW ASSOCIATION.

A meeting of the directors was held at the hall of the Incorporated Law Society on Thursday, the 16th inst., Mr. Robert Josiah Pead in the chair. The other directors present were: Mr. C. Burt, Mr. S. J. Daw, Mr. L. Desborough, Mr. S. H. Hargrove, Mr. H. C. Nisbet, Mr. R. H. Peacock, Mr. Sidney Smith, Mr. J. Vallance, and Arthur Carpenter (secretary). A sum of £785 was distributed in grants of relief; two new members were admitted to the association; and other general business transacted.

LEGAL NEWS.

OBITUARY.

The death is announced of Mr. STEPHEN DOWELL, formerly Assistant Solicitor to the Inland Revenue. He was the son of the Rev. Stephen Wilkinson Dowell, and was educated at Cheltenham College, Highgate School, and Corpus Christi College, Oxford, where, in the year 1854 he gained an honorary fourth class in law and history, and in the following year took his degree. After leaving Oxford he was articled to Mr. R. Bray, solicitor, of 99, Great Russell-street, and in June, 1863, was appointed Assistant Solicitor to the Board of Inland Revenue, a post he retained till August, 1896. Mr. Dowell was well known as the author of valuable works on the stamp laws and income and house taxes, and by his "History of Taxation and Taxes in England."

APPOINTMENTS.

Mr. F. H. MELLOR, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Recorder of Preston, in the place of Mr. H. W. Worsley Taylor, Q.C., resigned.

Mr. SPENCER LANGTON HOLLAND, barrister-at-law, has been appointed Associate of the Midland Circuit, in succession to the late Mr. Cox.

Mr. HENRY ATTLEE, solicitor, of 10, Billiter-square, has been elected a Member of the Council of Haldybury College, in the place of the late Baron Dimsdale, deceased.

Mr. WILLIAM CAMPBELL, advocate, of the Scottish Bar, has been appointed a Queen's Counsel.

INFORMATION WANTED.

Mrs. ELIZA MORTON, of "The Vinery," Pleasant-road, Southend-on-Sea, Essex, widow, and proprietor of "The City Type Foundry," No. 167, City-road, London, deceased. Any persons having knowledge of a will made by the above-named Mrs. Eliza Morton are requested to communicate with the undersigned. Todd, Dennes, & Lamb, solicitors, 22, Chancery-lane, London, and Alexandra-street, Southend-on-Sea.

GENERAL.

The honorary degree of LL.D. was conferred by the University of Cambridge on Wednesday on the Right Hon. Sir Nathaniel Lindley, Master of the Rolls.

It is stated that during the absence of Mr. Justice Wright on the Western Circuit, Mr. Justice Byrne will on Wednesdays, the 22nd and 29th inst., take any urgent company cases for him.

At the Bedford Quarter Sessions, on Tuesday, it was announced that Mr. J. T. Abdy, who had been Recorder of Bedford for twenty-eight years, has tendered his resignation.

The presentation to Mr. Justice Phillimore of the silver model of a

ship, subscribed for by the members of the bar practising in the Admiralty Court, in commemoration of his recent elevation to the bench was to take place at the judge's private residence at Eaton-place on Thursday last.

During the hearing of a case in Mr. Justice Granttham's court on Monday, says the *Times*, neither of the counsel briefed for the defendant were in court, and his lordship, on being informed that one of them was addressing a jury in another court, permitted the solicitor to cross-examine the plaintiff.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Times* says that the secretary of the Incorporated Law Society has been informed that the Government intends to abandon the clause in the Solicitors (Ireland) Bill which legalised the appearance at petty session courts of clerks as representing public departments in minor prosecutions. The concession is made in deference to the unanimous wish of the solicitors of Ireland.

The judicial business of the House of Lords was resumed on Tuesday. The present list, says the *Times*, consists of twenty cases, of which thirteen are English and seven are Scotch appeals, there being none from Ireland. There are no less than twelve cases awaiting judgment at the hands of the law lords, among them being the betting appeal of *Powell v. Kempton Park Racecourse Co.*

Among those who have accepted the invitation of the treasurer (Master Lewis Coward) and the benchers of Gray's-inn to dine on Wednesday, the 22nd of June, are H.R.H. Prince Christian, the Duke of Richmond and Gordon, the Earl of Coventry, the Earl of Morley, and the Earl of Camperdown. H.R.H. the Duke of Connaught will dine with his brother benchers on the same evening.

The Judicial Committee of the Privy Council resumed their sittings on Tuesday. There are, says the *Times*, 12 Indian appeals for hearing—viz., from Bengal 5, Allahabad 3, Oude 2, and Lower Burma and Bombay 1 each. A list of Colonial appeals to be heard will be issued later on. There are also 9 judgments in Indian and Colonial cases to be delivered, in addition to their lordships' judgment on the special reference in relation to the scheme of the Charity Commissioners in regard to St. Paul's School, the arguments in which were heard in June, 1896.

During the hearing of a special jury case last week, Mr. Justice Granttham said that he was sorry to inconvenience the gentlemen of the jury and the learned counsel and others, but an application had just been made to him to take a holiday to-day because there was no court for him to sit in. However, he thought it more important that work should be done even if there was inconvenience, and he proposed to sit to-day in his own room to take special jury cases. He thought it his duty to do so, and he hoped that it would make someone alter this enormous building, as the present state of things was a perfect scandal. He might add that on the previous day two judges, who would have formed a Divisional Court, were not sitting because there was no court for them.

Call-night during the present Trinity Term (the 22nd inst.) will, says the *Westminster Gazette*, be memorable for Lincoln's-inn, as, with its list of forty-four proposals, it once more leads the four Inns of Court in point of numbers—a position which has latterly been enjoyed by the Inner Temple. The two Temples (Inner and Middle) between them only muster fifty-seven, thirteen falling to Gray's-inn. The percentage of the candidates, which is screened in the dining-halls of the Inns, reveals all sorts and conditions of men. Only 12 per cent. of the entire number—113—of those desirous of joining the charmed circle of gentlemen of the long robe are the sons of barristers, and one solicitor foreakes the one branch for the other.

At the rising of the court on Wednesday Mr. Justice Byrne, addressing the bar, said: Mr. Ward, the senior registrar, is sitting to-day for the last time preparatory to the retirement which he has so well earned, and I should not like him to go without thanking him for the courtesy and assistance which he has always afforded me, both at the bar and since I have been on the bench. I believe I am expressing the sentiments of the whole of the Chancery bar in wishing him happiness in his retirement. Mr. Warrington, Q.C., the senior Queen's Counsel present, said he should like to associate himself and his brethren with what his lordship had said. The bar, especially the juniors, stood in a peculiar position towards the registrar, and the junior bar had been saved much anxiety and trouble by Mr. Ward. He did not think any member of the bar had ever applied to the registrar without receiving the greatest kindness and assistance. He hoped Mr. Ward would live many years to enjoy his well-earned repose. Mr. N. Ward bowed his acknowledgments.

The following officers and standing committees have recently been appointed by the General Council of the Bar: Chairman—Mr. H. H. Cozens-Hardy, Q.C., M.P.; vice-chairman, Mr. Joseph Walton, Q.C.; Executive Committee—Mr. E. Tindal Atkinson, Q.C., Mr. William Pickford, Q.C., Mr. Vernon R. Smith, Q.C., Mr. William Graham, Mr. T. T. Methold, and Lord Robert Cecil; Professional Conduct Committee—Mr. F. A. Bosanquet, Q.C., Mr. J. F. P. Rawlinson, Q.C., Mr. O. Leigh Clare, M.P., Mr. C. F. Gill, Mr. Yarborough Anderson, Mr. H. D. Bonsey, and Mr. R. F. Norton; Business and Procedure Committee—Mr. Montague Crackanthorpe, Q.C., Mr. F. O. Crump, Q.C., Mr. G. Pitt Lewis, Q.C., Mr. C. Swinfen Eady, Q.C., Mr. English Harrison, Q.C., Mr. E. W. Garrett, and the Hon. Frank Russell; Court Buildings Committee—Mr. C. M. Warrington, Q.C., Mr. E. L. Levett, Q.C., Mr. H. Bargrave Deane, Q.C., Mr. J. E. H. Benn, Mr. T. R. Bridgwater, Mr. Lancelot Sanderson, Mr. Guy Stephenson.

In proposing the toast of "The Profession of the Law" at the Mansion House banquet on Wednesday, Viscount Esher said that this was the thirtieth year at which successively he had been present at this dinner, but this was the first time that he had been asked to meet her Majesty's judges. He had been asked to propose "The Profession of the Law," but he thought they had already heard enough about the law. But what law? Was it that of the House of Lords? Well, he often did not understand it. Was it that which was administered by Sir F. Jeune? Well,

that part of the law he detested. Was it the law of the Court of Appeal? Of that he was too modest to speak. He could, therefore, only assume the position of a sort of advocate of them all—solicitors and bar as well. The one feature of our system which he desired to preserve was the absolute independence of judges and counsel alike. That independence had recently been strikingly manifested, not in this country, but in one of the Queen's dependencies, by a glorious act of which the profession might reasonably be proud. In coupling the toast with the Attorney-General, he said there never was a better Attorney-General.

The fifteenth report of the Comptroller of Patents, Designs, and Trade Marks has been published. It states that the applications for patents in 1897 numbered 30,958, of which about 6,000 were for inventions connected with cycling. This number represented an increase of 765, or 2.5 per cent., as compared with an increase in the year 1896 of 5,131, or 20.5 per cent. The total number of specifications received in 1897 showed an increase of 1,862, or 4.9 per cent., upon those of 1896, and this was the normal rate of increase. When the Patents Act of 1883 first came into force, and the initial fees were reduced from £25 to £4, it was thought probable that the average value of the patents granted would be diminished in a corresponding degree, as trivial inventions, upon which formerly it had not been worth while to pay high fees, would in future be made the subject of patents. The accuracy of this presumption could now to some extent be tested, and it appeared that the percentage of sealed patents which ran for fourteen years had fallen from 6 to 4.5 per cent. Of foreign applications, the largest number came from Germany and the United States of America, which contributed 2,459 and 3,084, as against 2,172 and 2,725 respectively in 1896. Japan, from which no applications were received in 1896, sent five in 1897, the same number as in 1895; but China, from which nine were received in 1896, sent only three. The total number of applications for the registration of trade-marks during the year (including 100 applications to the Cutlers' Company of Sheffield) was 10,624, as compared with 9,466 applications in the previous year. During the same period 3,695 trade-marks were advertised, and 3,358 trade-marks registered.

THE PROPERTY MART.

SALES OF THE ENSUING WEEK.

- June 20.—Messrs. ALFRED SAVILL & SON, at the Mart, at 1, a Valuable Freehold Residential Property known as Moor Hall, Harlow, Essex, comprising a very substantially built and most comfortable Family Mansion, containing 20 bed and dressing-rooms, a very fine library, picturesque park and woodland; the whole embracing an area of about 123 acres. Solicitors, Messrs. Pemberton & Cope, London. (See advertisement, June 4, p. 5.)
- June 20.—Messrs. GRANT, WHELDON & CO., at the Mart, at 1, the Beneficial Lease of the Shop and House, No. 47, Addison-road North, Holland Park, two doors from Holland Park-avenue. Solicitors, Messrs. Wilson, Wallis, & Co., London.—The corner House, No. 289, Cornwall-road, Notting Hill, producing £75 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Bannister, Williams, & Ram, London. (See advertisements, June 4, p. 9.)
- June 20.—Messrs. WEATHERALL & GREEN, at the Mart, at 1, in One Lot, Eight Freehold Houses, one with shop, at Dartford, producing £145 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Wm. Clark & Co., London.—Detached Residence known as Gladensmuir, Upper Richmond-road, Mortlake, value £65 per annum; also the nearly similar Residence, let at £32 10s. per annum.—Detached Residence, 385, Seven Sisters-road, Stamford-hill.—The Residence, No. 1, Tavistock-street, Gordon-square, of the estimated value of £130 per annum; possession on completion of the purchase. Solicitor, W. B. Styer, Esq., London. (See advertisements, June 4, p. 6.)
- June 21.—Messrs. BRADLEY, WOOD, & CO., at the Mart, at 2, Freehold Residential Estate in the parish of Hunsdon, about 20 miles from London, comprising a moderate-sized mansion, picturesquely situated in a well-timbered park, comprising an area of 938 acres. Solicitors, Messrs. Upton, Atkey, & Co., London.—Freehold Residential Estate, known as Hargrave, half a mile from Stanstead Station on the Great Eastern Railway main line, comprising a modern mansion, standing in a beautifully timbered park, surrounded by pleasure grounds, comprising 72 acres. Solicitors, Messrs. Johnsons, Long, & Williamson, London. (See advertisements, this week, p. 5.)
- June 21.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEBSON, FARMER, & BRIDGEWATER, at the Mart, at 2, Residential Property at Shooter's-hill, Kent, of about 4½ acres, comprising Residence on two floors, with lofty rooms; held from the Crown for about 67 years unexpired, at a moderate rent. Solicitors, Messrs. Clarke, Rawlins, & Co., London.—Freehold Family Residence, Buxton House, Snarebrook, with charming old gardens about an acre in extent, about half a mile from Snarebrook Station. The property has long frontages abutting on the Forest, which might be utilized for the erection of additional residences. Solicitor, Charles G. Scott, Esq., London.—Bijou Town House, Portman-street, Portman-square; held direct from the Portman Estate. Solicitor, H. R. A. Maclean, Esq., London.—Freehold Town House, Charles-street, Berkeley-square; let at £450. Solicitors, Messrs. Dawson, Bennett, & Ryde, and Messrs. Marson, Son, & Haigh, London. (See advertisements, June 4, p. 2.)
- June 22.—Messrs. DOUGLAS YOUNG & CO., at the Mart, at 2, Two Freehold Houses, at Chadwell Heath, Essex, a short distance from the station, producing £39 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Gard, Hall, & Rook, London.—A Block of Shop Property, known as Nos. 14 to 17, Tower-street, Upper St. Martin's-lane, W.C.; all let, producing a total of £339 10s. per annum.—A Leasehold House, Gilmere-road, Lewisham, rental £26 per annum; Leasehold Residence, Brookside, Stoke Newington, let at £38 per annum; Leasehold Weekly House, Kimberley-road, Clapham, producing £41 per annum. Messrs. Brighton & Lemon, London.—Four Weekly Houses at Wandsworth, producing £182 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Mann & Crimp, London. (See advertisements, June 4, p. 5.)
- June 22.—Messrs. ELLIS & SON, at the Mart, at 2, Two Leasehold Town Residences, held direct from the Portland Estate, situated in Harley-street. Solicitors, Messrs. Farrer & Co., London. (See advertisement, this week, p. 59.)
- June 23 and 24.—Messrs. SYMONS & SON, at the Mart, at 2 o'clock each day, Two Days' Sale of Freehold Ground-rents, Euston-road, St. Pancras, amounting to £1,597 9s. per annum, with early reversions. Solicitors, Messrs. Tyrrell Lewis, Lewis, & Broadbent, London. (See advertisement, June 4, p. 10.)
- June 23.—Messrs. FARREBROTHER, ELLIS, EGERTON, BRACH, GALSORTHY, & CO., at the Mart, at 2, valuable Freehold Property, situated at the corner of Gray's-inn-road and Harrison-street. Solicitors, Messrs. Paines, Blyth, & Huxtable, London. (See advertisement, this week, p. 56.)
- June 23.—Messrs. C. C. & T. MOORE, at the Mart, at 2, Two Leasehold Houses at Fadington, let at £102 per annum. Four Freehold Houses in Whitechapel-road, let at £100 per annum. Solicitor, D. A. Romain, Esq., London.—Freehold Shop, Station-road, Plaistow, let at £33 per annum; the Five-joined Dwelling-houses, let at £130 per annum; Five Freehold Dwelling-houses, let at £115 per annum. Solicitors, Messrs. Freeman & Sons, London.—Five Leasehold Houses in Abbey-lane, Stratford, let at £78 per annum; Freehold Dwelling-house, at Plaistow, let at £13 per annum. Solicitor, Robert T. Wrang, Esq., London.—Leasehold Houses, 25 and 36, South-grove, Mile End-road, let at 10s. each per week; the Leasehold Corner Premises, 51, George's-street, E. Solicitor, Charles Hind, Esq., London. (See advertisements, June 4, p. 8.)

(Continued from p. 561.)

In re Perry Almshouses Charity, Winterbourne, Gloucestershire In re Charitable Trusts Act, 1853 to 1894, and Local Government Act, 1894 app of Charity Commissioners for England and Wales from order of Mr. Justice Stirling, dated Feb 2, 1898 April 26

In re Mary Ross Charity & Charitable Trusts Acts, 1853 to 1894 app of the Churchwardens of the Parish of Hatfield from order of Mr. Justice North, dated July 10, 1897 (restored by order)

In re Beckett Kett v Harrison app of debts A J Harrison & ors from order of Mr. Justice North, dated Feb 2, 1898 April 26

Stainton v Hornsey app of debt from order of Mr Justice Romer, dated March 2, 1898 April 27

The Alcoy & Gandia Ry & Harbour Co, ld v Greenhill app of debts Lucien, Powell, & Co from order of Mr. Justice Stirling, dated April 14, 1898 April 27

In re Calcott & Elvin's Contract & V & P Act, 1874 app of T J Elvin from order of Mr. Justice Kekewich, dated March 31, 1898 April 29

In re Norton Norton v Dawson app of plt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 5, 1898 April 30

In re Wheelock Wheelock v Medina & ors app of plts C H from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated December 21, 1897 (security ordered) May 3

In re Registered Trade Marks, Nos 27,850 & 72,790 of John Batt & Co, & Patente, Designs, &c Acts app of John Batt & Co from order of Mr Justice Romer, dated April 21, 1898 (order not perfected) May 3

In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to 1890, & in re The New English Bank of the River Plate, ld app of B S Guinness from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated April 21, 1898 May 4

The Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co, ld v New Ixion Tyre and Cycle Co, ld app of plts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 4, 1898 (order not perfected) May 7

Hamilton v Major app of plt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 5, 1898 May 11

Fieldon v Mayor, &c., of Morley app of plt from order of Mr Justice Byrne, dated April 28, 1898 May 16

In re Clegg Colepeper v Colepeper app of dfts J Knight and anr from order of the President of Probate, &c, Division (sitting, &c) dated May 4, 1898 (order not perfected) May 16

Jacob v Jacob app of plt from order of Mr Justice Stirling, dated April 5, 1898 May 16

In re Whalley Stables v Whalley app of H Inchbold & ors from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 2, 1898 May 17

In re St John & Brako's Contract & V & P Act, 1874 app of E H E St John from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 12, 1898 (order not perfected) May 17

Morley v Stanley app of plt from order of President of the Probate, Divorce, & Admiralty Division (sitting, &c.), dated April 6, 1898 (order not perfected) May 18

Todd v Amyot app of plt from order of President of the Probate, Divorce, & Admiralty Division (sitting, &c), dated April 1, 1898 (order not perfected) May 19

Lord Bagot v Viscount Clifden app of dft Viscount Clifden from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 1, 1898 May 19

In re Worrall Worrall v Stuart app of plt from order of Mr Justice North, dated March 3, 1898 May 19

The New Ixion Tyre, &c, Co, ld v Spilisbury app of dfts from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 10, 1898 (order not perfected) May 19

In re The Stockport Ragged Industrial, &c, Schools app of Charity Commrs, &c from order of Mr Justice Stirling, dated March 17, 1898 May 20

In re White Cridland v White app of dft E J White from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated March 11, 1898 May 20

Darley v Beswick app of plt from order of Mr Justice Gorell Barnes (sitting, &c) from order, dated Feb 16, 1898 May 20

Ecclesiastical Commrs, &c v Pinney app of plts from order of Mr Justice Bigham (sitting, &c), dated May 13, 1898 (order not perfected) May 20

In re Protheroe & Phillips' Contract & V & P Act, 1874 app of F L Phillips from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated April 22, 1898 May 23

In re Roworth Featherstone v Featherstone app of dfts M A Featherstone & ors from order of Mr Justice Romer, dated Feb. 24, 1898 May 23

In re The Hille India Rubber Co ld Hille v The Hille India Rubber Co ld app of plt Heinrich Hille from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated March 24, 1898 (order not perfected) May 23

In re Grindley Clews v Grindley app of plt from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated Jan 27, 1898 May 25

Bolton v Heath app of plt from order of Mr Justice Bigham (sitting, &c), dated May 23, 1898 (order not perfected) May 25

Kingwell v MacAndrew app of plt from order of Mr Justice Bigham (sitting, &c), dated May 20, 1898 (order not perfected) May 27

In re The South Beach Land & Building Corp'n, Id, & Co's Acts app of O R Owen and anr from order of Mr Justice Wright, dated May 4, 1898 May 27
 In re Craddock & Luck's Contract & V & P Act, 1874 app of vendors, E Craddock & ors, from order of Mr Justice Kekewich, dated May 13, 1898 (order not perfected) May 27
 Kennedy v Goad app of dft from order of Mr Justice North, dated May 23, 1898 May 27

FROM THE QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

For Hearing.

(Final List.)

1897.

Trent Cycle Co. 11 v Davis app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Phillimore, dated Dec 20, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 12
 Mayor, &c of the Boro' of Thetford v County Council of Norfolk app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Will, dated Dec 12, 1897, at trial without a jury and cross notice of respts, dated March 18, 1898 Jan 21
 W Bartlett v H Mears & M A Box (trading, &c, as M A Box & Co) (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 19, 1898 Jan 27
 W Bartlett v W A Pearson & M A Box (trading, &c, as M A Box & Co) (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 19, 1898 Jan 27
 Stirling Cycle Works v Bowden & ors app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Jan 18, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex Jan 28
 Pettick Bros (respts) v The County Council of Dorset (appls) (Crown side) app of appls from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 14, 1898 Jan 28
 New London Credit Syndicate Id v Neale & ors app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Jan 15, 1898, at a trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 3
 The Queen v London County Council (Crown side) app of Comms from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 11, 1898 Feb 3
 Walker v Taft app of dft from judgt of the Lord Chief Justice, dated Dec 18, 1897, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 4
 The Attorney-General v The Right Hon Earl Grey (Revenue) app of dft from judgt of Justices Grantham & Channell, dated Dec 13, 1897 Feb 5
 Syer v Alder app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Jan 21, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 5
 Cole v Essex & anr app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Jan 24, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 8
 Simcoe v Pethick (Crown Side) app of dft from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 14, 1898 Feb 9
 Dymock v Showell's Brewery Co Id & anr app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Kennedy, dated Jan 12, 1898, at trial without a jury, Liverpool Feb 9
 The London & Universal Bank Id (in liquidation) v Sabow & Co app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Jan 12, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 11
 A C Watson v J H Holmes (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 17, 1897 Feb 11
 C E Reynolds, &c (next friend) v H L Holloway (Crown Side) app of plt from judgt of Justices Day & Lawrence, dated Jan 18, 1898 Feb 11
 The City of London Brewery Co Id, appls v The Comms of Inland Revenue, respts (Revenue) app of appls from judgt of Justices Grantham and Channell, dated Dec 14, 1897 Feb 12
 Bonner & anr v Tottenham & Edmonton Permanent Investment Building Soc app of plts from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 7, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 12
 Crane v Bevan (Sheppard, 3rd party) app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Feb 9, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 15
 Bennett (wife, &c) v Slater & anr app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Jan 26, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 15
 Brown v Sharpington app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Channell, dated Jan 25, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 17
 Taylor & anr v Geary app of dft from judgt of Mr Justice Ridley, dated Feb 8, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 18
 Boaler v Wertheimer, Lea, & Co app of plt in person from judgt of The Lord Chief Justice, dated Feb 1, 1898, at trial with special jury, Middlesex (security ordered) Feb 22
 Rolls v Prell & ors app of dfts from judgt of Mr Justice Mathew, dated Feb 16, 1898, at trial without a jury, Middlesex Feb 23
 Tregillus v Spillers & Bakers Id app of plt from judgt of Mr Justice Darling, dated Feb 10, 1898, at trial with special jury, Winchester Feb 23

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

TRINITY SITTINGS, 1898.

Before Mr. Justice North.
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Shaw v Holland act
 In re Graydon's Patents, No 18,007 of 1893 & No 16,927 of 1894 ptn entered in Witness List
 Smith v Bridgwater act
 Blair v Fuller's Id act
 A Lawes Id v Goodchild act
 South African Republic v La Compagnie Franco-Belge du Chemin de fer du Nord, &c act

Zumbeck v Bradford act
 Stedman v Carpenter act & m f j
 T P Lee & Co Id v T P Lee act
 Paine v Clements act
 Weymes v Knollys act & m f j
 In re Elliott Milnes v Hare act
 T E Brinsmead & Sons Id v Lomax act & m f j
 Kemp v Lowenfeld act
 Pankhurst v Reed act
 Dunlop Pneumatic Tyre Co Id v Wedge Pneumatic Tyre Co Id act
 Bolton v Hall act
 Smith v Sharp act
 Cox v Manuelle act
 Tanton v Bull act
 Urban District Council of Chiswick v Arnold (J Whitaker 3rd party) act
 Irvine v Irvine & Co Id act
 Ross v Caseley act
 Atkins v King act (not before July 4)
 Schwarz v Cape Colonization Co Id act
 Maison Helbronner Id v Duveen act
 The Provident Clerks', &c Assoc v Wilson act & m f j
 Macarthur v Macarthur act & counter-claim
 Chapman v Barnett act
 Dunbar v Dunbar act
 Whittle v Morris act
 Walcott v Walcott act
 Currie v Chepstow Water Co act
 The Manchester Ship Canal Co v Company of Proprietors of Rochdale Canal act
 Akeroyd v Morley act & counter-claim
 Roche v Hobson act & m f j
 Fleming v Loe act & counter-claim
 Dingle v Coppen Coppen v Dingle act & counter-claim
 Holland v Chelsea Electricity Supply Co Id act without pleadings
 Cox v Borthwick act
 Wright v Davies act
 Fitzgerald v Bransom, Kent, & Co, Id act
 Chinnock v Rural District Council of Hartley Wintney act (pleadings to be delivered)
 Figgess v Same act (without pleadings)
 Phillips v Same act (without pleadings)
 Chandebos v Burry act
 Royal Sovereign Gold Mining Co, Id v King act against dft T H Davis
 Smith v Devon & Exeter Turkish Bath Co Id act
 Pilley v Shaw act (without pleadings)
 The Earl's Court Hotels Id v Evans act
 The Tachytype Manufacturing Co Incorporated v The Monotype Machine British Patents Syndicate Id act
 In re The Truffault Cycle & Tube, &c, Co Id & Co's Acts motn entered in Witness List
 Barnett v Meekin act
 The Salt Union, Id v Davis' Chlorine Process, Id act
 Wickham v Ogilvy act
 Hart v Brie act
 Parr v General Investors' Syndicate, Id act
 Weston v Sewell act
 Wells v Schofield act
 In re Sheba, Queen, &c & Co's Acts motn entered in witness list by order
 United, &c Tea Co, Id v Lipman act
 Miller & Aldworth v Sharp act

Chadburn v Bladon act
 Sellars v Dalley act
 Gellygaer School Board v Llangynider School Board act
 King v St Martin's Syndicate, Id act
 Fitch v Callingham act
 Smith v Rickard act
 Nowell v Allen act
 Wright v Stanfield act
 Saccharin Corp'n Id v Haines, Ward & Co act
 Turnbull v Halford act (Sunderland D k)
 The Phoenix Metal Die, &c, Co Id v The Bostwick Gate & Shutter Co Id act
 C de Murrieta & Co Id v Mendel act
 Mendess v Benjamin act and counter-claim
 Morgan v Owens act & m f j
 Sharp v Sharp act set down without pleadings
 Hinton v Whittle act
 J & W Nicholson & Co Id v Keene act & counter-claim
 Hunter v Lamb act & counter-claim
 Hannan's Brownhill Central Gold Mines Id v the Croesus South United Gold Mines Id act
 James v Richardson act
 Barwell v McMahon act
 Rosherville Gardens Co Id v Curnock act
 Stodart v Nursey act
 Nutt v Easton act
 Melin v Lesty act
 British Motor Co Id v Burgess Cycle Co Id act
 Gordon v Wright act
 Roberts v Gwyrfai District Council act
 Parker v Everett act
 Bear v Payne act
 Leigh v Fenwick & Co act
 Arnold v Northamptonshire Union Bank Id act
 Plummer v Hawkins act
 Livesey v Patent Gas Enrichment Syndicate Id act
 Coulthard v Whitstable Oyster Fishery Co act
 Causes for Trial (without witnesses).
 Watson v Bwies act
 Girling v Girling act
 Trustee of J M Corderoy v Matthews act & motn for judgt
 Goode v Higge act (short)
 In re Applications of J Crossfield & Sons, Id, Nos 204,165 & 204,302, & In re Oppositions by Lever Bros, Id, Nos 2,656 & 2,658 & Patents, &c, Acts motn ordered to go into Non-witness List
 Chowne v Cutler act & m f j
 Wheatley v Rainford m f j (short)
 Adjourned summonses.
 In re Simpson Ramsay v Oxley
 In re Webb Knollys v Venn
 In re McAlpin Maggison v Pater-son
 In re Wilson Cooke v Wilson
 In re Lamb Clough v Arnold
 Worsey v Baxter
 In re Garnault Garnault v Garnault
 The Whiteley Exerciser Id v Gamage
 In re Emery Mollett v Mollett
 In re Gray Dunsantory v Gray
 In re Allen Bassett v Allen
 In re Tucker Tucker v Tucker
 In re Pickworth Snaith v Parkinson
 In re Williams Williams v White
 In re Whiteley St Paul v Robinson
 In re Westwood Bunting v Westwood

In re Grove Grove v Bramstein
 In re Ellis Ellis v Nicholls
 In re Dixon Haimbach v Dixon
 Coleman v Coleman
 In re Blackler Blackler v Blackler
 In re Clark Brown v Harkness
 In re Wooler Wooler v Wooler
 In re Gundry In re Mills Mills v
 Gundry
 In re Gundry Mills v Mills
 In re G Murdoch, &c
 In re Day Day v Sprake
 In re Meeson In re Geere Stokes
 v Geere
 In re Procter Procter v Ellis
 In re Joseph Davis' Charity, &c
 In re Gray Gray v Gray
 In re Rae Ferguson v Smith
 In re Drage Drage v Drage
 In re Waters & Nelson & V & P
 Act, 1874
 Evans v Newfoundland Ry Co
 In re Hall's Settlement and Settled
 Land Act
 In re Wait Hopper v Fox
 In re Elger Elger v Elger
 In re Soltan & Settled Land Acts
 Jones v International Water &
 Sewage Purification Co, ld (to
 come on with fur con)
 In re Cullum Cullum v Cullum
 In re Spencer Bennett v Lund
 (not before June 23)
 Walters v Wyand
 In re White Walters v Gladwin
 In re Swinscow Swinscow v Swin-
 scow
 Record v Hill
 In re Amey Harvey v Amey
 In re Amey Amey v Harvey
 In re Atkinson Northcote v Atkin-
 son
 In re The Arauco Co, ld Heming
 v Arauco Co, ld Tarks v Same
 In re Camfield Parrott v Camfield
 Parrott v Payne
 In re Dunahoe Griffiths v Griffiths
 Saccharin Corp, ld v Brasby v
 Hinchliffe, ld
 In re Robinson Fletcher v Hume
 In re Roberts Williamson v
 Palmer
 In re Randle Friswell v Martin
 In re Williamson Williamson v
 Winterburn.

Further Considerations.

In re Cocker Holcombe v Hol-
 combe fur con
 In re Tottenham Tottenham v
 Tottenham fur con adjd from
 chambers
 In re Hampson Hurst v Hampson
 fur con (short)
 In re Parkinson Greenwood v
 Topham fur con (pt dead)
 In re W Clover ld Little v W
 Clover ld fur con
 Bartlett v Bartlett fur con
 In re Cotterill Goodman v Scho-
 field fur con

Before Mr. Justice STIRLING.
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Neave v Duke of Richmond act
 In re A Christie's Trusts & Trustee
 Act petn entered in Witness
 List
 Kane v T Guest & Co act
 The Vacuum Oil Co v Hollway
 act
 The Silkstone & Haigh Moor Coal
 Co ld v Edey act
 Brown v Harley act
 Cooke v Ackroyd act
 Peters v Owen act
 Owen v Peters act
 Williams v London & North-
 Western Ry Co act
 Wood v Middleton act (remitted
 from County Court of White-
 haven)
 Barker v Oakden act

Banks Price v Owen act
 Lloyd v Powell act
 Mansell v Mansell act
 Terry v Brickwell act
 Sleeman v Cragoe act
 English & American Machinery Co,
 ld v Hirshowitz act
 Bennett v Collins act
 Martin v Martin act
 Catling v Barnett act
 In re W Owen's Patent, No 12,368
 of 1898 petn ordered to go into
 witness list
 Basset v Graydon act
 Doolette v Coolgardie Mint, &c Co,
 ld act & counter-claim
 The City & Home Counties, &c
 Building Soc v Came act &
 motn for judgt (transferred from
 Kekewich, J)
 Same v Same act & m f j
 May v Robert Church & Roberts
 act (security ordered)
 Frederick v Young act & counter-
 claim
 Cooper v Laurence act & m f j
 Simms v Salomons act
 Still v Cook act
 Russell v Young act
 Chingford Syndicate, ld v Andrews
 act
 Graydon v Blackpool Gigantic
 Wheel Co act
 Pooler v Grant, Bulcraig & Co act
 Fay v Clarion Newspaper Co ld
 act
 Burford v Burford act & counter-
 claim
 In re Shorey Smith v Shorey act
 Hind v Thompson act
 Baker v Behrens act
 Drinogbler v Wood act & m f j
 In re Griffin Griffin v Griffin act
 Booth v Australian Mines Agency
 ld act
 Keynes v Leslie & Co ld act
 Hett v Carpenter act
 Babington v Worrall act & counter-
 claim
 In re Wortham Wortham v
 Wortham act (not before May 1)
 Tubeless Pneumatic Tyre, &c ld v
 French Tubeless Tyre Co ld
 act (Birmingham DR)
 Hart v Mattoy act
 Manfield v Rose act & m f j
 In re Evans Jones v Jones adjd
 sums entered in witness list
 In re Perry Davis v Volkman act
 Budd v Pullman act
 Dainler Motor Co, ld v Bowen act
 Hiscott v Carter act
 Hiscott v Short act
 Whitman v Hambourg act
 Chancereille v Ratcliffe act
 Winsor & Co, ld v Armstrong & Co
 act
 Richards v Kerby act
 Mathews v Wilmer act (pleadings
 to be delivered)
 In re Pickworth Pickworth v
 Pickworth adjd sums to be
 treated as act for trial
 Maryon v Motum act
 Peter v Godfrey act
 The Windermere Gas, &c, Co v
 Crosthwaite act
 Carter Gear Case Patents Co v
 Elswick Cycles Co, ld act
 Bow v Bew act
 Abbe v Matheson & Co act set
 down against defts Matheson &
 Co
 King v Keen act
 Peters v The Owen Stone Co, ld
 act
 Bovey v Day act
 Williams v The Rhymney Iron Co
 act
 Pulleyne v Aldous act
 Lord Battersea v Clement's-inn ld
 act
 Australian Mines Agency ld v Mc-

Kay act & m f j (transferred
 from North J)
 White v Briley act
 Hannan v Murgatroyd act
 Reid v Houldsworth act
 Tweedale v Ashworth act
 In re Mackey Davison v Turner
 act
 Emmerson & Sons v North act
 Tomlinson v Sandford & Willett
 act
 W Edge & Sons ld v Gallon & Son
 act (pleadings to be delivered)
 Fowke v Haynes act
 Russell v Clare Estate Syndicate ld
 act
 Gisborne v Licensed Trade Pro-
 tectorate ld act
 Lord Royston v Turkish Regie
 Export Co ld act
 The Gresham Life Assce Soc ld v
 Ranger Trading, &c act
 Greenwood v The Leather Shod
 Wheel Co ld act
 Fitch v Barry act
 The Golden Cross ld v Sinclair act
 (not before July 1)
 Teale v The 165th Starr-Bowkett
 Building Soc act
 Oxenden v Phipson act
 Vinnal v Dandy act & counter
 claim
 Lyon v Close act
 Salton v New Beeston Cycle Co ld
 act
 The Saccharin Corp, ld v Fahlberg
 act
 J Cleave & Son ld v Herbert & Co
 act
 McDiarmid v Barrett act
 In re Denys Askew v Montague
 act
 In re the Co's Acts, 1862 to 1890,
 and In re the Victoria Reef Gold
 Mines ld motn entered in Wit-
 ness List
 British Motor Syndicate ld v An-
 drew & Co ld act
 Fisher v Powell act
 Gutteridge v Pneumatic Brake Co
 ld Pneumatic Brake Co ld v
 Gutteridge act
 Bebro v MacCullum act
 Hope v Walter act
 Allen v Porter act
 Fache v Whetham act
 Saunders v Allen & Son act
 Stevens v Santley act
 Horton v Horton act
 Fleming v Brady act

Causes for Trial (without witnesses)
 and Adjourned Summonses.
 In re Cuthbert Cuthbert v Cuth-
 bert adjd sums and adjd sums
 of defts (restored)
 In re Wright De Chair v Garnett
 adjd sums (restored)
 Bailey v Bullock m f j (short)
 Nixon v Tasker m f j (short)
 Clark v Stokes two adjd sums,
 dated Feb 24 and April 19, 1898
 pt hd
 In re Brown Barbes v Rolls adjd
 sums
 In re Gundry & Cooksey's Contract,
 &c adjd sums
 Hudson v The Chatteris Engineer-
 ing Works Co motn for judgt
 The Grand Junction Water Works
 Co v The Hampton Urban Dis-
 trict Council point of law set
 down by order, May 5, 1898
 Holford v The Urban District
 Council of Acton question of
 law raised by pleadings set down
 by order, March 18, 1898
 In re The Halifax Commercial Bank
 & Wood & V & P Act, 1874 adjd
 sums
 Baring Gould v Sharkington Com-
 bined Pick, &c, ld and Arbitra-
 tion Act, 1889 adjd sums

Levy v Stogdon adjd sums

Further Considerations.

In re Jones Parker v Zethbridge
 fur con adjd from Chambers
 Roselaar v Abrahams fur con &
 adjd sums
 In re Buxton Buxton v Buxton
 fur con
 In re Cooper Alpe v Robson 2nd
 fur con

Before Mr. Justice KEENEWICK.
 Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
 Taylor v Morris act
 Watkins v Cronmire act without
 pleadings and adjd sums
 Watson v Jennings act
 Nall v Nall act
 Blew-Jones v Cook act
 Cooper v Floate act
 Terry v Bates act
 Zumbeck v Briggs act
 Biseker v Nurcombe act and m f j
 Purcell v Chincock act (not before
 July 5)
 Armstrong v Coolgardie Mint &
 Iron King Gold Mines ld (in
 liquidation) act
 Brocklebank v Shepherd, the
 younger act
 Bywaters v Wilde act & m f j
 Woodd v Coolgardie Mint & Iron
 King Gold Mines ld act
 Donn v Gowrvitch act & counter-
 claim
 Perrins v Bellamy act & question
 of liability of 3rd parties (set
 down by order N T Foster &
 anr, 3rd parties)
 Fitch v The Thames Yacht Build-
 ing Co, ld act
 The Eastner Kellner Alkali Co, ld v
 Commercial Development Corp,
 ld act
 Adams v Peters act
 Peron v Burney, the younger act
 The Checkheaton Urban District
 Council v Firth act
 The Guthrie Hall Co, ld v Gamage
 act
 Ruda v Zolty act
 Chambers v Winton act
 Pemberton v Hughes act
 Bewsher v Hodgson act
 Field v Jessop act (transferred
 from Bedford County Court)
 Cummins v Perkins & Co act
 Watt v The Joint Stock Institute,
 ld act
 Edwards v Thomas act
 Wood v Thompson act & adjd
 sums in Wood v Thompson by
 order
 Charter v Watson act
 Dewrance v Smith & Co act
 Meredith v Hilder act
 Lever Bros ld v Beddingfield act
 (June 8)
 Same v Van den Berghs ld act
 (June 8)
 Fleissig v Harmony Proprietary Co
 ld act
 Sinclair v Mella act & counter-
 claim (June 14 after pt hd)
 Bloice v Pitt act
 Long v Vestry of Fulham act
 In re James James v Griffith act
 In re Johnson Burton v Kersey
 act
 Friedmann v Kilaby act
 In re Lilley Catt v Fowke act
 Harris v Easton act
 Harrison & Sons v Pearce act

Actions for Trial (without wit-
 nesses).
 Clay v Hodgson m f j (short)
 In re Simons Houschen v Simons
 m f j (short)
 Joicey-Cecil v Joicey-Cecil special
 case (set down by order)

Adjourned Summonses.
In re Lilley Catt v Fowke adjd
summs
In re Louis Gurney v Gurney
adjd summs
In re Waylett Cashmore v Jellicoe
adjd summs
In re Plews Plews v Plews adjd
summs

Before Mr. Justice ROMER.
'Causes for Trial (with witnesses).
Coleman v North act
Wilkins & Denton v Cruley act
Duke v Bayly act
Burlinson v Spry act
Cowen v Truefitt, ld act
Mackney v Oakes act
Barrett v Barbeau act & counter-
claim
Strangways v Read act
Morgan v Lord Gort act
In re The Companies Acts, 1862 to
1890, and In re Miller & Co,
Margarine, ld motu entered in
witness list

Vernon v Billson act
Seddon v Pakeman act
Waller v Outhwaite act
Heaton v Priestman act
Brasington v Cox act
In re The Mines Acquisition, &c,
Co, ld Clement v Mines, &c, ld
act
Levy v Sawyer act
Friary, Holroyd's, & Healy's
Breweries, ld v Singleton act
The Carter Gear Case Patents Co
v Sander act
Toms v Clacton Urban District
Council act without pleadings
(first witness day)

In re Brown In re Tilley Button
v Taylor act
In re Wicken Wicken v Few act
& m f j
Starkey v Jonds act
Baker v Brooks act
Wanton v Coppard act
Smeeton v Styer act
Shuter v Godwin act
Hughes v Smith act
Oliver v Hinton act
King v Mendham act without
pleadings

Mills v Allen act
Hobbs v Allen act (advanced by
order)

Moon v Waterlow Bros & Layton
ld act

In re Welsford Welsford v Wels-
ford act

Economides v Morris act
Marsh v Moody act
Bouchette v Ballard act

In re Ball Ball v Ball act
Rogers v Hale act & counter-claim
Bryant v Glover act

Day v Singleton act (transferred
from North, J)

Hayward v Tolhurst act
Richardson v Moody act & counter-
claim

McCulloch v Chantry act
Pyke v Grafton Galleries, ld act
Mountain v Kidd act

Hayes v New Incandescent, &c,
Gas Co ld act

Dewrance & Co v Fletcher Bros
act

Hadley v Corp'n of Worcester act
Brooke v Higgs act

In re Crompton & Shawcross ld &
Co's Act, 1862 (Expte G Ratcliffe)
motu set down in Witness List

In re Parker Maughan v Clark
act

Lazenby v Clinton act & m f j
Martin v Macarthy act
Shaw v Goldbro act

Smith v Rothman act without
pleadings
re Trade Marks, Nos 189,368,

193,011 and 193,012, class 45, of
F & J Smith, &c motu entered
in Witness List to come on with
act

Warburg, Dymond, & Co v Scott
& Co ld act

Apostoloff v The Apostoloff Auto-
matic Telephone, &c ld act

In re The Gutta Percha Corp'n ld &
Co's Act, 1862 motu entered in
Witness List by order

Paynton & Co ld v Snelling, Lam-
pard, & Co ld act

Philpott v Rudham act
The East Surrey Water Co v Taylor
act

The Sutton District Water Co v
Taylor act

Santley v Wilde act
Molyneux v Bond action

Vincett v Harrison act
The Automatic Air Tight Co ld v
The Hermetically Sealed Jar
Syndicate ld act

Gillson v Seiter act without plead-
ings

Hart v Murray act
Smith v Jones & Son ld act

Beardmore v Interchangeable
Automatic Machine Syndicate
ld act without pleadings

In re Bartons Bartons v Church
act

Lloyd v Thomas act
Cambridge ld v Hurley act with-
out pleadings

Inman v Hobbs' Manufacturing Co
act

Marquess of Abergavenny v Fitness
act

Adlington v Screach act
Burgess v Viola act

Davis v Cycle Manufacturing Tube
Co ld act

Bostock v Horton act
Hudson v Kirkhouse act

Ibbotson Bros ld v Ibbotson act
Burden v Samber act without
pleadings

Earl Temple v Williams act
Davey v Tayler act

Hunt v Polkinghorn act
Searle v Dagg act

Hoffnung & Co v Salisbury act
Clanrikarde v Kent Coal, &c Co ld
act

Bennett v Attwood act
Bartholomew v Bartholomew act

Causes for Trial.
(Without Witnesses and Adjourned
Summonses).

Board of Management of West
London Schools v Staines Urban
District Council act (short)

In re L Tussaud's New Exhibition
ld Brown v Norton adjd smns

In re G Lock & Co ld and Co's Act
motu to rectify entered in non-
witness list (not before June 10)

Gould v Coaks motu entered in
non-witness list

In re T Smith Hale v Quin adjd
summs

In re Townsend Townsend v
Townsend adjd smns

In re Whalley Whalley v Bumbay
adjd summs

Vernon v Reynolds adjd summs
Incandescent Gas Light Co, ld v
Best Incandescent Gas Share
Syndicate, ld motu entered in
non-witness list

In re Tildesley Tildesley v Tildes-
ley adjd summs
Fitch v Chapman act
In re Hathway Jones v Ford adjd
summs

Loder v Loder adjd summs
In re Oakley & Wares' Contract &
V & P Act, 1874 adjd summs
In re Wrexham, Mold, &c Ry Co
and Ry Co's Act adjd summs

Pritchett v Atkin m f j (short)
In re Devon, &c, ld Kingsbury v
Devon, &c, ld m f j (short)

In re J Williams, &c adjd summs
In re South Australian Petroleum,
&c, ld Halkett v South Aus-
tralian, &c, ld adjd summs

In re A Burgis & 10 & 11 Vict c 98
adjd summs

In re Baxter Baxter v Baxter
adjd summs

In re Morris James v London &
County Banking Co, ld adjd
summs

In re Davies Matthews v Llewellyn
adjd summs

In re Burleigh Mountford v Tay-
lor adjd summs

In re Hale Hale v Hale adjd
summs

Hoddinott v Biggs adjd summs

Further Considerations
Ward v Matthews fur con

In re Barry Fowler v Brocklebank
fur con

Before Mr. Justice WRIGHT.
(Sitting as an additional Judge of
the Chancery Division.)
Companies (Winding-up).

Petitions.
Joseph Bull, Sons, & Co, ld (petn
of M T Shaw & Co)

Glamorgan Central Permanent
Benefit Building Soc (petn of the
Co)

Industrial Securities Investment
Co, ld (petn of E A Hamblyn)

Bidaasa Ky & Mines, ld (petn of F
Thorn)

Woolley Coal Co, ld (petn of York-
shire Banking Co, ld)

Dawe & Co ld (petn of A Wit-
church)

Eastern Counties Bacon Factory ld
(petn of Lalor and Kinderley)

Otis Steel Co ld (petn of L Relton)

G & S Bracknell ld (petn of The
Continental Bottle Co)

South Kent Water Co (petn of J.
Oakes & Co)

Pontypridd Improvements Co ld
(petn of P J Dunn & ora)

Goodwins, Jardine & Co ld (petn of
The Industrial and General Trust
ld)

Moore Bros & Co ld (petn of Nichol-
son, Sons, & Daniels)

Gold Reefs of Western Australia
ld (petn of G E D Durnford)

Liberty Consolidated Gold Mines ld
(petn of C Frey)

North Borneo Prospecting & Cultiva-
tion Syndicate ld (petn of W
P R Newlands)

Bonara Italian Steel and Tin Plate
Manufacturing Co ld (petn of G
O A Sommer)

Globe Blocks Mining Co ld (scheme
of arrangement) (petn of C J
Fauvel and the South African
and Australian Exploration &
Development Syndicate ld)

London & Paris Finance & Explora-
tion Co, ld (petn of Reservoir
Hub & Components Co, ld)

Wheel Club, ld (petn of H J Grim-
wade)

West Australian Pastoral & Coloni-
zation Co, ld (petn of Land Corp'n
of West Australia, ld)

Umtoli Gold Reefs Co, ld (petn of
R G Bagshawe & ora)

Abercorn Reefs, ld (petn of A Legge
& ora)

North Golden Crown, ld (petn of
White Feather Reward Claim, ld)

Oriental Palace of Varieties, ld
(petn of Shelley & Co, ld)

United Kingdom Debenture Bank,
ld (petn of The Agence Havas)

South Australian Petroleum Fields,
ld (petn of J Senior)

National Co for the Distribution of
Electricity by Secondary Genera-
tors, ld (petn of H O Buelle)

Ariel Arc Lamp Syndicate ld (petn
of M J Jones and ora)

Coolgardie Mint & Iron King Gold
Mines, ld (petn of A Watters)

Ryder & Co ld (petn of Pfeil & Co)

African India Rubber, Mahogany &
Development Co ld (petn of W R
Horncastle)

La Compagnie Francaise des An-
thractites du Pays de Galles (petn
of Mansel v Vieira)

West Australian Market Trust ld
(petn of G F Rowe)

Same (petn of H H Gethen)

Humber Ice & Coal Co, ld (petn of
J Dawson)

Industrial Inventions Development
Co, ld (petn of J W Vickers)

Worsleys ld (petn of W M Allin)

Tower Publishing Co ld (petn of
Morrison & Gibb ld and ora)

National Stores ld (petn of Anglo-
American Oil Co ld)

London & Cripple Creek Reduction
Corp'n ld (petn of H L Daniell)

Brazilian Syndicate ld (petn of
Lancaster Railway Carriage &
Wagon Co ld)

Doveston, Davey, Hull & Co (petn
of Greenock Cabinet Making Co
ld)

Princes River Gold Mines ld (petn
of Cazaux, Dey, & Co)

Accles ld (petn of Nile's Tool
Works Co ld)

John Day & Co ld (petn of J
Murphy)

United Mines Ore Reduction Co ld
(petn of Bayley's West Gold
Mining Co ld)

Pentonville Stamping & Engineer-
ing Co ld (petn of John Wilkin-
son & Sons)

New Victoria Mansions Restaurant
Co ld (petn of T H Carter)

Arauco Co ld (petn of E Edmond-
son & ora)

Mosley Hotel ld (petn of John
Dewar & Sons ld)

Chancery Division.
Societe Vinicole de Turquie ld (ptn
of Co and shareholders to rescind
resolutions)

Manhanet Steamship Co ld & re-
duced (ptn of Co)

Wrexham Market Hall Co ld (mem-
orandum of association—petn of
Co)

Carnarvonshire & Merionethshire
Steamship Co ld and reduced
(petn of Co)

London Union Land Co ld & re-
duced (petn of Co)

Leipzig Crystal Palace Co ld & re-
duced (petn of Co)

Leigh Woods Land Co, ld & re-
duced (petn of Co)

Swedish Assoc, ld & reduced (petn
of Co)

Court Summonses.
Companies (Winding-up).

Lands Allotment Co ld (taxation
of bill)

London and General Bank ld (for
leave to make a set off)

Odell ld (on claim)

Private Investors' Asscn, ld (on
claim)

Peabody Gold Mining Corp'n, ld (as
to construction of thirty-ninth
Article of Association)

Coolgardie Consolidated Gold Mines
ld (to vary list of contributories)

Same (Same)

Bonara Italian Steel & Tin Plate
Manufacturing Co ld (for mis-
feasance) with witnesses

Lindsay's Extended (East) Gold Mines ld (on claim)
 Marble (Moreau Rae) Syndicate ld (to reverse decision of Official Receiver rejecting proof)
 New Travellers' Chambers ll (preliminary objections)
 Same (for stay)
 G G Ratty, ld (to remove liquidator)
 Thrutchley Bros, ld (for misfeasance)
 Moore Bros, ld (for balance order)
 Howard Ship Building Co, ld (as to issue of debentures)
 Mountain Ash Steamship Co, ld (for balance order)

Chancery Division.

Stubber v T Daniel & Co ld (for sale)
 Same v Same (for leave to cross-examine)
 Same v Same (declare dividend)
 Same v Same (for discovery)
 Somerset v Land Securities Co, ld (for compensation on sale)
 United Empire Trading Co, ld
 Meller v United Empire Trading Co, ld (to commit)

Before Mr. Justice BYRNE.

Causes for Trial (with Witnesses)
 Transferred by Order, dated May 5, 1898.

McLeod v Powers act for trial against dft Power (June 28)
 Harward v Australian South African Gold Exploration Co ld act
 Williams v Wheeler act
 In re Chard Chard v Chard act
 Trustees, Executors & Securities Corpn ld v Deutsche Bank act (not before June 16)
 Moran v Raby act
 Vilanova v Domenech v The Olot and Gerona Ry Co ld act (not before June 17)
 In re Willcox Armitage v Pauling act
 Bovril ld v Bouillon Fleet ld act
 Same v MacSymons' Stores ld act
 Same v McBirnie act
 Same v Evans act
 Same v J P Evans & Co act
 June 13 after pt hd
 Mascias v Anglo-American Construction Co ld act (not before June 10)
 Simmance v W Sugg & Co ld act
 Helios Electricitas Actien Gesellschaft v Braulik act
 Darby v London Agency ld act
 Delannoy v The Hostalrich Copper Syndicate, ld act
 Edison United Phonograph Corp, ld v Roberts act (s o for amendment)

Keates v Keates act & counter-claim
 Lord Hastings v North-Eastern Ry Co act
 Clerical, Medical, & General Life Assce Soc v Rogers act & m f j
 Reynolds v Biltcliffe act
 Duhamel et Cie v Cunningham Egg Fruit Co act
 Harper & Battcock v Lewis act
 Bates v Chignell act (not before July 15)
 Ellis v Churley act
 Priestley v Oxley act (not before June 15)
 Hobbs v Mills act
 Banister v Landon act
 Paynter v Galindez Bros act and counter-claim (not before June 3)
 Hoskin v J Shoolbred & Co act
 Mayor of Newcastle-on-Tyne v Houseman act
 Same v Francis act
 Same v Jackson act
 Same v Coote act (not before June 21)
 Shurey v Kinnis & Co act
 Chesley v Cheston act
 Holford v Blalberg act set down by order (pleadings to be delivered)
 Davis v White Cliffs Opal Mines, ld act
 White Cliffs, & Co v Davis act (transferred from Q B Division)
 Allen v Pyatt & Co act (61 mingham D R)
 Huntly-Gordon v Hall act
 Bergheim v Bryan act & m f j
 Nat Prov Bank of England, ld v Tominy act
 Inskip v Horwood act
 In re Mallam Mallam v Mallam act
 Jones v Koral act
 Gompertz (trading, &c) v The Credit Reform Assoc act
 Roe v Roe act
 Pickstock v Earl act
 Browne v Calnan act
 Becher v Davey act
 Franklin v Lee act
 In re Hale Lilley v Foad adjd sumps entered in Witness List
 Meikle v Card act
 Harvey v Greig action
 Evelyn v. Howard act without pleadings (set down by order, Dec. 10, 1897)
 In re Cercel's Patent, 1896, No 15,493 & Patents, &c Acts petn entered in Witness List
 Fabriques de Produits Chimiques de Thann and de Mulhouse v Lafitte & Co act
 In re Smetto's Patent, No 1,670 of 1888 petn entered in Witness List

CARDIFF CATTLE SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 16, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Frank Lord Perry, 11, High st, Cardiff

CENTRAL MONOMOTAPA, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before June 27, to send their names and addresses, and full particulars of debts or claims, to Leonard Dampier, 30 and 31, Clement's lane

COMPAGNIE VIMBOR FRANCO-BELGE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 7, directed to be heard on June 22. Drake & Co, 21, Broad lane, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16

DICKENS CUSTER MEER, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to R. C. Power, 13, Copthall avenue

GREAT TALUNA GOLD MINES, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 3, directed to be heard on June 17. Wyatt & Co, 5 and 6, Clement's inn, Strand, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16

HANNAH'S CONSOLIDATED GOLD FIELDS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 9, directed to be heard on June 17. Wyatt & Co, 5 and 6, Clement's inn, Strand, solors for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16

HANNAH'S GOLDEN GROUP, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles Lloyd, 77, Bishopsgate st Within. Williams & Neville, Winchester House, Old Broad st, solors to the liquidator

HARLINGTON GRANE BRICK AND TERRA COTTA CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before July 14, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Hall, Son, & Frankland, 1, Queen st, Acorington, solors to the liquidators

HOSLABRICH COPPER SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 26, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Robert Dick Dalgleish, 4, Fenchurch st. Dale, Newman, & Hood, Cornhill, solors for the liquidator

LA CORCORDE AND CITY AND SUBURBAN (MATABELELAND) GOLD DEVELOPMENT CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 25, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Perry and William Fowell Ansner, 6, Drapers' gardens. Dale & Co, 75 and 76, Cornhill, solors to liquidators

PALACE OF VARIETIES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Thomas Fryer, 85, Gracechurch st Birchalls, Gracechurch st, solors for liquidator

POLLITZER'S TRADING SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 31, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Julius H Moritz, 10, Drapers' gdns. Goldberg & Co, West st, Finsbury circus, solors for the liquidator

RESERVOIR RUB AND COMPONENTS CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Arthur Edward Darville, Bevois House, 25, Basinghall st. Dennison & Co, 71, Gracechurch st, solors for liquidator

SIMPSON'S PROSPECTING SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 27, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to David Davies, 140, Leadenhall st

STANDARD MUSICAL MAGAZINE, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before July 7, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Percy Helmore, 84, Chancery lane

UNSTOL GOLD REEF CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, directed to be heard on Friday, June 17. Wyatt, Digby, & Co, 5 and 6, Clement's inn, solors for the petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16

UNION JACK GOLD MINING CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before June 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Edwin Perry and William S. Williams, 6, Drapers' gdns. Dale, Newman, & Hood, Cornhill, solors for the liquidators

UNITED SERVICE PRESS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 9, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Frederick William Lord, 60, Walling st

WALBROOK SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 30, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts and claims, to Percy H Sainsbury, Worcester House, Walbrook. Stoneham, 81 Michael's House, Cornhill, solor for liquidator

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, JUNE 14.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.
LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

GODFREY GILES & CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 11, directed to be heard on Wednesday, June 21. Hastings, 65, Lincoln's inn fields, solors for petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 21

LILLY & LILLY, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 11, directed to be heard on June 22. Hickson & Moir, Blomfield House, 22, New Broad st, solors to petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 21

LONDON AND NEW ZEALAND FINANCE CORPORATION, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Herbert Moir, 130, Cannon st

MAINLAND EAST, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 9, directed to be heard on June 22. Dennison & Co, 71, Gracechurch st, agents for H. G. Tanner, Birmingham, solor for petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 21

MATLOCK TRAMWAY CO, LIMITED (Matlock Bridge)—Creditors are required, on or before June 24, to send their names and addresses, and particulars of their debts or claims, to Job Smith, Matlock Bank, Matlock. Sleigh, Matlock, solor

PICTORIAL STAINED GLASS SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented June 10, directed to be heard June 22. M S Rubinstein, 20, Regent st, solor to the petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 21

PLUMBERS STORES, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Willi am Nicholson, 12, Wood st. Phelps & Co, Aldermanbury, solors to the liquidator

TAKEMAN & WILLIAMS, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before Aug 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Thomas Chantler Middleton, 20, Princess st, Manchester. Boots & Co., Manchester, solitors to the liquidator

UNITED MINES ONE REDUCTION CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, directed to be heard on Wednesday, June 23. Ashurst, Morris, Crisp, & Co, 17, Throgmorton avenue, solors for the petners. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 21

UNLIMITED IN CHANCERY.

THE UNITED LAKES MUTUAL BUILDING SOCIETY (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required to send particulars in writing of their claims. Stoneham & Sons, 150, Fenchurch st, solors for the liquidators

FRIENDLY SOCIETIES DISSOLVED.

ALEXANDRA PHILANTHROPIC SICK AND BURIAL DIVIDING SOCIETY, Sutton, Lancs. June 1
 PEOPLE'S 210 LOAN SOCIETY, Fox and Hound Hotel, Carlton, Notts. May 25
 SETHERRS HOME LODGES, L.O.A.S., Cowlinge, Suffolk. May 1

WARNING TO INTENDING HOUSE PURCHASERS AND LESSEES.—Before purchasing or renting a house, have the Sanitary Arrangements thoroughly Examined, Tested, and Reported Upon by an Expert from Messrs. Carter Bros., 65, Victoria-street, Westminster. Fee quoted on receipt of full particulars. (Established 21 years.)—[ADVT.]

WINDING UP NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, JUNE 10.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ABERCORN REEFS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, Dec. 8, will be heard on Friday, June 17. Wyatt, Digby, & Co., 5 and 6, Clement's-inn, solors for the petner. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of June 16

BESWICK, BRADFORD, AND CLAYTON RECREATION CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before Monday, July 25, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Mr Ernest Etobella, Park View, Church-st, Beswick. Sutton, Elliott, Turnbull, & Mayne, Manchester, solors to the liquidator

BILLING & CO (BRISTOL), LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before July 9, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Ernest Newton Tribe, Albion chambers, Bristol

CREDITORS' NOTICES. UNDER ESTATES IN CHANCERY.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 20.

BLACKBURN, JOHN, Colne, Lancs, Gent June 17 Schofield v Birtwistle, Registrar, Manchester
BLANK, PERCY WILLIAM June 24 White v Stark, Stirling, J Wm Stark, Southampton
SPALDING, ALFRED CROFTON, High st, Notting hill June 20 Bright v Turner, Stirling, J
Shepherd, Finsbury circus

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 27.

BREWSTER, ELIZABETH, Whithy, York June 30 Johns v de Garston, Kekewich, J
Kennedy, Clement's inn, Strand

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 31.

HARVEY, GEORGE HENRY, Old Town, Clapham, Grocer June 28 Harvey v Harvey,
Stirling, J Calley, Old Serjeants' inn

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, June 3.

HINKS, JOHN, Station rd, Brixton, Auctioneer June 27 Street v Hinks, Romer, J Prior
& Co, Lincoln's inn fields

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, June 7.

WILLIAMS, ROBERT, Carnarvon, Builder July 1 Williams v Griffiths, Romer, J Lloyd
& Co, Carnarvon

UNDER 22 & 23 VICI. CAP. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, May 20.

ALLEN, SILVANUS FRANCIS, Folkestone, Revenue Officer June 20 Watts & Watts,
Folkestone
ANDREW, THOMAS, Tregynon, Montgomery, Farmer June 7 Woonnam, Newton, North
Wales
BALLS, MARGARET ELLEN, Lowestoft, July 2 Wiltshire & Son, Lowestoft
BARBER, HENRY, Billingsgate Market, Fish Salesman July 20 Keene & Co, Seething In
Bedford, William, Hoyland, York, Hardware Dealer June 3 Woodhead, Huddersfield
BLENCOWE, MARGARET, King's Lynn, Norfolk June 30 Partridge & Co, Lynn
BOLWELL, ALBERT NORMAN, Nottingham, Draper June 24 James Sinnott & Son,
Bristol
BOWMAN, MARGARET, Gateshead June 28 Swinburne, Gateshead
BOYD, JOHN, Exeter June 30 Cowdell, Torquay
BROWN, ISABELLA, Townhead, Penrith, Mason June 24 Arnison & Co, Penrith
BURDERIE, the Rev JAMES, Coton in the Elms, Derby June 16 Lowe & Auden, Burton
on Trent
CHATTERIS, MARY ELIZABETH, Hoylake, Cheshire June 30 Davidson & Morris, Queen
Victoria st
CLARKE, JOHN CLELLAND, Farnworth, nr Bolton June 18 Monks, Bolton
COOKE, HARRIETTE ELIZABETH, St Leonard's on Sea June 10 Hoppgoods & Dowson
Spring gons
COOPER, THOMAS JAMES, Spaldwick, Huntingdon, Merchant June 20 Hunnybun & Sons,
Huntingdon
COPE, ANN, Buckden, Hunts June 30 Hunnybun & Sons, Huntingdon
DE THIERRY, EDOARDO RICHARD, Genoa, Merchant July 1 Trinder & Co, Cornhill
EVANS, DAVID, Brecon June 4 D W J Thomas, Brecon
FAYE, MATILDA, Greenhays, Manchester July 2 Cooper & Sons, Manchester
GIBBINS, JOHN, St Edmund's, Exeter, Sawyer May 23 Dunn & Baker, Exeter
GROSE, FREDERICK, Bermondsey st June 25 Irvine & Borrowman, Hart st, Mark lane
HAGSTADT, SARAH ANN, Kingston upon Hull June 24 Freer Buckton, Hull
HAGSTADT, SOPHIA BETSY, Kingston upon Hull June 24 Freer Buckton, Hull
HILL, MATILDA, Coggeshall, Essex July 1 Surridge, Coggeshall
HULSE, JOSEPH WHITWORTH, Salford, Engineer July 16 Slater & Co, Manchester
JACQUES, JOHN, Croydon, Manufacturer July 1 Peacock & Goddard, South sq, Gray's
inn
KIPPING, ANN, South Lambeth June 24 Holmes & Son, Clement's In
KIRBY, JAMES, Olton, Warwick, Tailor July 16 Smith, Birmingham
LAWSON, JOHN NORMAN, Liverpool July 18 Harrison & Burton, Liverpool
LAWTON, MARY, Liverpool July 18 Harrison & Burton, Liverpool
LILL, ELIZABETH ANN, Grimsby June 3 Brown & Sons, Gt Grimsby
MCWHINNIE, HENRY, Stone, Stafford, Plumber June 21 Birch, Stone
MARTIN, JESSIE, Ulverston, Lancs July 7 Miller & Co, Liverpool
MASON, GEORGE, Brixton, Beerhop Keeper June 20 Grant & Co, Strand
MAYALL, SAMUEL, Moseley, Lancs, Cotton Spinner June 20 Addleshaw & Co, Man-
chester
METCALFE, JANE, Camden Town July 10 Thompson & Groom, Raymond bldgs
MILLER, JAMES, Ashill, Norfolk June 30 J & J Milligan, Edinburgh
MORISON, ARTHUR DUFF, Durrington Manor, nr Worthing June 25 Angove & Bromwich,
Gt Winchester st
MORLAND, Lady ALICE MAUD, Brighton July 1 Drake & Lee, Lewes.
NEWTON, JOHN, Hartgate, York June 24 Buckley, Leicester
OVERWOOD, CHARLES FREDERICK GOTTFRIED, Dashwood House July 10 Goldberg & Co,
West st
POWER, MARY, Earl's Court June 17 Hunter & Haynes, New sq, Lincoln's inn
QUAIN, Sir RICHARD, Harley st, M D, F R S June 30 Fayer & Co, Lincoln's inn fields
RICHARDS, ELIZABETH ANN, Fishguard, Pembroke June 24 Tombs, Fishguard
RHODES, GEORGE, Fenton, Staffs, Licensed Victualler June 14 Boulton, Burslem
RHODES, THOMAS KEELING, Hanley, Staffs, Innkeeper June 14 Boulton, Burslem
ROBERTS, ELIZABETH, Liverpool June 30 Stephenson, Liverpool
RUSSELL, ELIZABETH, Chelmsford, Licensed Victualler June 30 Tijou, Stratford

SLEEMAN, ROSE EMMA, Sithney, Cornwall June 1 Clifford & Co, Finsbury pavement
SNAITH, JOHN, Leicester July 1 Harvey & Clarke, Leicester
STEPHENSON, THOMAS, Torriaholme, Lancs, Wheelwright June 1 Saul, Lancaster
STUART, WILLIAM, jun, North Kensington June 21 Hill & Co, Glasgow
TANTON, GEORGE, Brabourne, Kent, Farmer June 1 Hallett & Co, Ashford, Kent
TETLEY, JOHN HENRY, Thornbury, York, Wool Merchant June 16 Beldin & Ackroyd,
Bradford
THAXTER, ROBERT, Southdown, Norfolk, Dairyman June 22 G & C F Lucas, Gt
Yarmouth
THOMAS, GEORGE PROSSER, Leicester, Civil Engineer June 30 Astley Roberts, Circus
place
TULLOCH, MARGARET, Swansea June 22 Moy & Co, Swansea
VORNBROOK, FRANK, Lee, Kent June 20 Finch & Turner, Cannon st
WADE, JOHN PARR, Norwich, Woollen Draper July 1 Clabburn, Norwich
WEBB, HERBERT, Philip In June 30 Crouch & Co, Lawrence In
WILSON, CHARLES, Yoxford, Suffolk, Doctor, and CAROLINE June 30 Southwell & Fry,
Saxmundham, Suffolk
WITMAN, The Rt Rev Monsignor THOMAS, York June 15 Hauby Holmes, Barnard Castle,
Durham

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 24.

ALLEN, MARY ANN, Bath July 4 Kent, Lincoln's inn fields
ANDREWS, THOMAS, Tregynon, Farmer June 17 Woonnam, Newtown, North Wales
BARBER, ALFRED, Brighton, Licensed Victualler July 9 Upperton & Bacon, Brighton
BARTHOLOMEW, WILLIAM, Maidstone, Builder June 30 Joalen, Maidstone
BESSEMER, Sir HENRY, Denmark Hill June 30 Hyde & Co, Ely pl
BOWEN, EDMUND, Oxtou, Chester, Rice Broker July 5 Hill & Co, Liverpool
BOYS, HENRY, Walsall, Miller June 24 Slater & Co, Darlaston
BRIGGS, THOMAS, Quariton, Lancs June 21 Fullagar & Hulston, Bolton
BROMEHEAD, ELLEN CRAWFORD, Upper Berkeley st June 30 Lake & Lake, New sq,
Lincoln's inn
BRUNBY, RICHARD, Southport June 30 Marriott & Co, Manchester
BRUCE, JONATHAN, Healey Batley, York, Rag Merchant June 25 Brearley, Batley
COGHILL, HARRY, Hastings, J P June 30 Blagg & Co, Chendle
COLEMAN, EDWARD, Fooks Cray, Kent June 24 Boorman, Martin's In
COOPER, JOHN, Bishopsgate July 1 Nunn & Popham, Leadenhall st
CROOKE, HENRY, Cheltenham June 28 Ticehurst & Sons, Cheltenham
DENTON, MARY ANN, Hastings July 4 Brighton & Lemon, Fenchurch st
DRAYCOTT, WILLIAM, North Wingfield, Derby, Farmer July 30 Black & Marshall,
Chesterfield
FOSTER, EDWIN, Pontefract June 4 Thomas Swales, Pontefract
GREEN, JAMES, Cirencester June 24 Haygarth, Cirencester
GROVE, ROBERT, Pall Mall July 1 H C Coote & Ball, Curator st, Chancery In
HASLIP, WILLIAM NICHOLAS, Borough Market, Lighterman June 27 Hogan & Hughes,
Martin's In
HATTON, JOHN, Liverpool June 15 Evans & Co, Liverpool
HAYES, JAMES, Ponders End, Nurseryman July 1 Stoneham & Sons, Fenchurch st
HUGHES, JOHN, Aberystwyth July 1 Davies, Aberystwyth
JAMESON, MARY, Salford, June 30 McDonald, Manchester
JOHNSTON, JOSEPH, Brigade Surgeon, St John's Wood park June 24 Smith, Chancery In
JOLLY, ISABELLA, Dalston June 22 Paterson & Co, Bouverie st
KNIGHT, ABRAHAM, Woolwich, Butcher July 8 Duke, Gresham st
LEACH, MILES, Bolton, Beerseller June 30 Finney, Bolton
LEES, MARY LOUISA, Bayswater June 30 Wade, Old Jewry
MACANDREW, Mrs AGNES ROSE, Torquay June 30 Eardley-Holt & Co, Charles st, St
James's square
MACE, HENRY, Deptford, Ironfounder June 10 Leach, Halifax
MCWHINNIE, HENRY, Stone, Stafford, Plumber June 21 C Birch, Stone
MACHON, ISAAC, Spanby, Lincoln, Farmer June 30 Johnstone & Williams, Nottingham
MORRIS, PRESCOTT, Upholland June 6 Peace & Ellis, Wigan
PENDLEBURY, JOHN, Leigh, Lancs, Coal Miner June 20 Hope & Garstang, Atherton
RAISTRICK, SAMUEL, Brighton June 24 Buckwell, Brighton
REDMILE, JOHN, Spalding, Lincoln June 30 Maples & Son, Spalding
REDMILE, MARY, Spalding, Lincoln June 30 Maples & Son, Spalding
RICHARDS, WILLIAM FRANCIS, Pinner, Middlesex, Schoolmaster June 14 Devonshire pl
ROOKER, ESTHER MARY, Lytham, Lancs June 30 Murray & Co, Birchin lane
SAUNDERS, Captain THOMAS HARRY, Hove, Sussex June 24 Fillmer, Brighton
SMITH, HANNAH, Birmingham June 24 Docker, Birmingham
STRETTILL, LUTHERA VITTORIA, Clifton, nr Bristol June 30 Williams & James, Thames
Embankment
STUBBS, MARY ANN, Clapham June 18 P Burdett-Cunningham, for Burdett-Cunningham
& Co, Parliament st
SULLIVAN, EDWARD, Nottingham June 25 Wells & Hind, Nottingham
TAYLOR, GEORGE, Nottingham, Engineer June 30 Johnstone & Williams, Nottingham
TIMES, SAMUEL, Oxford, Butcher June 24 Mallam & Son, Oxford
TODD, JOHN, Rochester June 30 Lucas & Bailey, Clifford's inn, Fleet st
TODD, MARY, Rochester June 30 Lucas & Bailey, Clifford's inn, Fleet st
WARSOP, SARAH ANN, Nottingham June 25 Spencer, Nottingham
WILD, SARAH, Littleborough June 30 Charles Haywood & Co, Manchester
WOOD, LUCY, Madeley, Salop, Nurse June 6 Thorn, Iron Bridge, Shropshire

BANKRUPTCY NOTICES.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, June 10.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM HENRY, Madeley, Salop Madeley Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 ALLAN, HENRY, Shepperton, Commission Agent High Court Pet May 10 Ord June 7
 ANDRESS, ERNEST, Islington, Restaurant Proprietor High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 ARMSTRONG, STEPHEN, Bakewell, Derbyshire, Grocer Derby Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 ASH, WILLIAM JOHN, Exeter, China Dealer Exeter Pet June 4 Ord June 4
 BARRATT, GEORGE, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer Nottingham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BARTON, ALFRED WILLIAM, Bridgwater, Oil Dealer Bridgwater Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BENTLEY, MELLOR, Goldsmith st, Tie Manufacturer High Court Pet May 23 Ord June 7
 BOOTH, RICHARD, Forest Hill, Kent, Solicitor Greenwich Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 BOSTOCK, WILLIAM, Oldham, Draper Oldham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BRETTON, EDWIN, Margate, Newagent's Manager Canterbury Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 BROOKS, AUGUSTUS NOBLE, Brington, Somerset, Butcher Bristol Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BROWN, EDWARD, Forbury, Lancs, Cycle Manufacturer Liverpool Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 BROWN, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Fruiterer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 CADOGAN, ISAAC, Pembroke, Blacksmith Pembroke Dock Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 CAWS, SAMUEL DAWSON, Cowes, I of W, Draper Newport Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 CHALCRAFT, JAMES, Shanklin, I of W, Greengrocer Newport Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 COLLIER, JOHN JAMES, and EDWIN HOUSLEY, South Noranton, Derbys, Plumbers Derby Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, JOHN, and THOMAS JOHN DAVIES, Aberaman, Aberdare, Grocers Aberdare Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, WILLIAM, Pontardawe, Glam, Saddler Neath Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DAY, JOHN, Leeds, Chemist Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DAYMAN, WILLIAM, Chulmleigh, Devon, Carpenter Barnstaple Pet May 25 Ord June 6
 DOWELL, TOM, Upton, Somerset, Miller Exeter Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DUDMAN, ABRAHAM, Midhurst, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DURCAN, ROBERT, Madeley, Salop, Accountant Madeley Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 FORD, JOHN, Worcester, Boot Factor Worcester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FRANCIS, GEORGE, Newlyn Town, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FURNACE, A., & SONS, Keswick, Cumberland, Lapidaries Cockermouth Pet May 23 Ord June 6
 GIBSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Hollingbourne, Kent Maidstone Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 GRANGER, GEORGE GIBSON, Cumberland, Innkeeper Carlisle Ord June 3
 GREEN, JAMES WILSON, Birkenhead, Furniture Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 HAKETON, JOHN GROVES, West Bridgeford, Notts, Commission Agent Nottingham Pet May 24 Ord June 6
 HARRISON, HENRY ROBERT, Ipswich, Upholster Ipswich Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 HOOLEY, ERNEST TERAH, Hill st, Berkeley sq, Company Promoter High Court Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 INWOOD, MARION, Gravesend, Cycle Manufacturer Rochester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 JEFFRIES, LAMBERT CHARLES, Stoke, Ipswich, Butcher's Assistant St Yarmouth Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 LEATHERDALE, GEORGE FANNING, Merton, Surrey, Journalist Croydon Pet June 1 Ord June 6
 LOWE, SAMUEL, and ARTHUR FREDERICK LOWE, Manchester, Glass Dealers Manchester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 MANHAM, ANNIE, Leeds, Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 MANTON, WILLIAM, South Kensington, Boot Maker High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 MILNE, ALFRED JOSEPH, Aldershot, General Provision Merchant Guildford Pet June 4 Ord June 7
 NURSE, HAROLD, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 OATES, WILLIAM, Strand High Court Pet May 13 Ord June 8
 OLIVANT, GEORGE, Patcham, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet May 21 Ord June 6
 POPPLEWELL, COX, & CO, St Mary ax, General Merchants High Court Pet June 1 Ord June 7
 PORTER, FREDERICK CHARLES, Deptford, Kent Greenwich Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RANSHAW, JOHN WILLIAM HENRY, Withersn, York, Joiner Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RILEY, GEORGE THOMAS, Cornwall rd, Brixton hill, Cloth Merchant High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 SADDLER, JOHN, Birkenhead, Machine Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 SHAW, ROBERT FELKIN, Marple, Ches, Carrier Stockport Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 STONEMAN, JOHN DURANT, Plymouth, Butcher Plymouth Pet June 6 Ord June 6

STREET, CHARLES GEORGE, Nottingham, Cattle Dealer Nottingham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 WARD, JOHN, Folkestone, Baker Canterbury Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 WATLING, EDWARD, Darlington, Fish Dealer Stockton on Tees Pet May 27 Ord June 4
 WRIGHT, WALTER STANFORD, GRACE ELIZABETH WRIGHT, and HOWARD TROPHILUS WRIGHT, Gt George st, Westminster High Court Pet June 8 Ord June 8

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of May 27, and for the Amended Notice published on the 3rd June:
 ABRAHAM, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Manufacturer Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23

FIRST MEETINGS.

ABRETT, ARTHUR ROBERT, Cardiff, Grocer June 21 at 11 Off Rec, 25, Queen st, Cardiff
 ALLAN, HENRY, Shepperton, Commission Agent June 30 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 ALLEN, JAMES CRYSTON, Canterbury, Law Clerk June June 18 at 12 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 ANDRESS, ERNEST, Islington, Restaurant Proprietor June 17 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 ASH, WILLIAM JOHN, Exeter, China Dealer June 23 at 10.30 Off Rec, 15, Bedford circus, Exeter
 BARRATT, WILLIAM, Cheltenham, Mon, Publican June 20 at 12 Off Rec, Westgate chambers, Newport, Mon
 BENTLEY, MELLOR, Goldsmith st, Tie Manufacturer June 20 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 BIRNING, GEORGE, Treadlaw, Glam, Contractor Pontypridd Pet May 24 Ord June 7
 BOOTH, RICHARD, Forest Hill, Kent, Solicitor Greenwich Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 BOSTOCK, WILLIAM, Oldham, Draper Oldham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BRETTON, EDWIN, Margate, Kent, Newagent's Manager Canterbury Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 BROOKS, AUGUSTUS NOBLE, Brington, Somerset, Butcher Bristol Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BROWN, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Fruiterer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 CADOGAN, ISAAC, Pembroke, Blacksmith Pembroke Dock Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 CHALCRAFT, JAMES, Shanklin, I of W, Greengrocer Newport Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 COLLIER, JOHN JAMES, and EDWIN HOUSLEY, South Noranton, Derbys, Plumbers Derby Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, JOHN, and THOMAS JOHN DAVIES, Aberaman, Aberdare, Grocers Aberdare Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, WILLIAM, Pontardawe, Glam, Saddler Neath Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DAY, JOHN, Leeds, Chemist Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DAYMAN, WILLIAM, Chulmleigh, Devon, Carpenter Barnstaple Pet May 25 Ord June 6
 DOWELL, TOM, Upton, Somerset, Miller Exeter Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DUDMAN, ABRAHAM, Midhurst, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DURCAN, ROBERT, Madeley, Salop, Accountant Madeley Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 FORD, JOHN, Worcester, Boot Factor Worcester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FRANCIS, GEORGE, Newlyn Town, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FURNACE, A., & SONS, Keswick, Cumberland, Lapidaries Cockermouth Pet May 23 Ord June 6
 GIBSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Hollingbourne, Kent Maidstone Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 GRANGER, GEORGE GIBSON, Cumberland, Innkeeper Carlisle Ord June 3
 GREEN, JAMES WILSON, Birkenhead, Furniture Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 HAKETON, JOHN GROVES, West Bridgeford, Notts, Commission Agent Nottingham Pet May 24 Ord June 6
 HARRISON, HENRY ROBERT, Ipswich, Upholster Ipswich Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 HOOLEY, ERNEST TERAH, Hill st, Berkeley sq, Company Promoter High Court Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 INWOOD, MARION, Gravesend, Cycle Manufacturer Rochester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 JEFFRIES, LAMBERT CHARLES, Stoke, Ipswich, Butcher's Assistant St Yarmouth Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 LEATHERDALE, GEORGE FANNING, Merton, Surrey, Journalist Croydon Pet June 1 Ord June 6
 LOWE, SAMUEL, and ARTHUR FREDERICK LOWE, Manchester, Glass Dealers Manchester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 MANHAM, ANNIE, Leeds, Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 MANTON, WILLIAM, South Kensington, Boot Maker High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 MILNE, ALFRED JOSEPH, Aldershot, General Provision Merchant Guildford Pet June 4 Ord June 7
 NURSE, HAROLD, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 OATES, WILLIAM, Strand High Court Pet May 13 Ord June 8
 OLIVANT, GEORGE, Patcham, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet May 21 Ord June 6
 POPPLEWELL, COX, & CO, St Mary ax, General Merchants High Court Pet June 1 Ord June 7
 PORTER, FREDERICK CHARLES, Deptford, Kent Greenwich Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RANSHAW, JOHN WILLIAM HENRY, Withersn, York, Joiner Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RILEY, GEORGE THOMAS, Cornwall rd, Brixton hill, Cloth Merchant High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 SADDLER, JOHN, Birkenhead, Machine Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 SHAW, ROBERT FELKIN, Marple, Ches, Carrier Stockport Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 STONEMAN, JOHN DURANT, Plymouth, Butcher Plymouth Pet June 6 Ord June 6

WALKER, THOMAS NICHOLLS, Margate June 16 at 1 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 WARD, JOHN, Folkestone, Baker June 23 at 9 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 WATSON, JOHN RICHARD, Margate, Builder June 23 at 9.30 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 WELCH, HENRY, Great Yarmouth, Commission Agent June 18 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 WILSON, J, E Dulwich, Surrey, Builder June 22 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st

ADJUDICATIONS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM HENRY, Madeley Madeley Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 ANDRESS, ERNEST, Islington, Restaurant Proprietor High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 ARMSTRONG, STEPHEN, Bakewell, Derbyshire, Grocer Derby Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 ASH, WILLIAM JOHN, Exeter, China Dealer Exeter Pet June 4 Ord June 4
 BARRATT, GEORGE, Nottingham, Lace Manufacturer Nottingham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BARTON, ALFRED WILLIAM, Bridgwater, Somerset, Oil Dealer Bridgwater Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BIRNING, GEORGE, Treadlaw, Glam, Contractor Pontypridd Pet May 24 Ord June 7
 BOOTH, RICHARD, Forest Hill, Kent, Solicitor Greenwich Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 BOSTOCK, WILLIAM, Oldham, Draper Oldham Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BRETTON, EDWIN, Margate, Kent, Newagent's Manager Canterbury Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 BROOKS, AUGUSTUS NOBLE, Brington, Somerset, Butcher Bristol Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 BROWN, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Fruiterer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 CADOGAN, ISAAC, Pembroke, Blacksmith Pembroke Dock Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 CHALCRAFT, JAMES, Shanklin, I of W, Greengrocer Newport Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 COLLIER, JOHN JAMES, and EDWIN HOUSLEY, South Noranton, Derbys, Plumbers Derby Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, JOHN, and THOMAS JOHN DAVIES, Aberdare, Glam, Grocers Aberdare Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 DAVIES, WILLIAM, Pontardawe, Glam, Saddler Neath Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DAY, JOHN, Leeds, Chemist Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DAYMAN, WILLIAM, Chulmleigh, Devon, Carpenter Barnstaple Pet May 25 Ord June 6
 DOWELL, TOM, Upton, Somerset, Miller Exeter Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 DUDMAN, ABRAHAM, Midhurst, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 DURCAN, ROBERT, Madeley, Salop, Accountant Madeley Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 FORD, JOHN, Worcester, Boot Factor Worcester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FRANCIS, GEORGE, Newlyn Town, Cornwall, Grocer Truro Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 FURNACE, A., & SONS, Keswick, Cumberland, Lapidaries Cockermouth Pet May 23 Ord June 6
 GIBSON, WILLIAM GEORGE, Hollingbourne, Kent Maidstone Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 GRANGER, GEORGE GIBSON, Cumberland, Innkeeper Carlisle Ord June 3
 GREEN, JAMES WILSON, Birkenhead, Furniture Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 HAKETON, JOHN GROVES, West Bridgeford, Notts, Commission Agent Nottingham Pet May 24 Ord June 6
 HARRISON, HENRY ROBERT, Ipswich, Upholster Ipswich Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 HOOLEY, ERNEST TERAH, Hill st, Berkeley sq, Company Promoter High Court Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 INWOOD, MARION, Gravesend, Cycle Manufacturer Rochester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 JEFFRIES, LAMBERT CHARLES, Stoke, Ipswich, Butcher's Assistant St Yarmouth Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 LEATHERDALE, GEORGE FANNING, Merton, Surrey, Journalist Croydon Pet June 1 Ord June 6
 LOWE, SAMUEL, and ARTHUR FREDERICK LOWE, Manchester, Glass Dealers Manchester Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 MANHAM, ANNIE, Leeds, Leeds Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 MANTON, WILLIAM, South Kensington, Boot Maker High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 MILNE, ALFRED JOSEPH, Aldershot, General Provision Merchant Guildford Pet June 4 Ord June 7
 NURSE, HAROLD, Kingston upon Hull, Grocer Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 OATES, WILLIAM, Strand High Court Pet May 13 Ord June 8
 OLIVANT, GEORGE, Patcham, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet May 21 Ord June 6
 POPPLEWELL, COX, & CO, St Mary ax, General Merchants High Court Pet June 1 Ord June 7
 PORTER, FREDERICK CHARLES, Deptford, Kent Greenwich Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RANSHAW, JOHN WILLIAM HENRY, Withersn, York, Joiner Kingston upon Hull Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 RILEY, GEORGE THOMAS, Cornwall rd, Brixton hill, Cloth Merchant High Court Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 SADDLER, JOHN, Birkenhead, Machine Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 6 Ord June 6
 SHAW, ROBERT FELKIN, Marple, Ches, Carrier Stockport Pet June 8 Ord June 8
 STONEMAN, JOHN DURANT, Plymouth, Butcher Plymouth Pet June 6 Ord June 6

Amended notice substituted for that published in the London Gazette of May 27, and for the amended notice published on June 3
 ABRAHAM, HENRY, Kingston upon Hull, Cycle Manufacturer Kingston upon Hull Pet May 23 Ord May 23

ADJUDICATION ANNULLED.

HAYHURST, WILLIAM SILAS, Cummersdale, nr Carlisle, Potato Dealer Carlisle Adjud April 29 Annul May 19

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, June 14.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

AKERS, WILLIAM, Cardiff, Tea Dealer Cardiff Pet May 27 Ord June 9
 ASHTON, THOMAS ARTHUR, Longton, China Merchant Stoke upon Trent Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 BAKER, ERNEST EDWARD, Plymouth, Insurance Agent Plymouth Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 BARNES, JOHN, Sheffield, Cattle Dealer Sheffield Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 BARTON, JOSEPH HENRY, South Anston, York, Builder Sheffield Pet May 17 Ord June 9
 CHESTER, GEORGE, Birmingham, Baker Birmingham Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 CROMPTON, MOSES, Eastney, Bournemouth, Fried Fish Merchant Portsmouth Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 DAVIES, JACOB, Pontypridd, Quarryman Pontypridd Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 DERRICK, THOMAS, Bridgend, Tailor Cardiff Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 DRINGBRIER, ERNEST, Dover, Fishmonger Canterbury Pet April 25 Ord June 9
 ENGLAND, THOMAS HAIGH, Slithwaite, nr Huddersfield, Commercial Traveller Huddersfield Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 ENGLAND, LUCY, Holt, Wilts Bath Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 EVANS, ABRAHAM LLOYD, Brynethin, Bridgend, Political Agent Cardiff Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 EVANS, STANLEY, Northampton, Engineer Northampton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 FLAYELL, ALBERT HENRY, Halesowen, Worcester, Insurance Agent Stourbridge Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 FLOOD, MORRIS JAMES, Bristol, Boot Manufacturer Wells Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 FUSSELL, GEORGE WILLIAM, Weymouth, Draper Dorchester Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 GARNETT, WILLIAM, and REGINALD JEFFERIES GARNETT, Wolverhampton, Drapers Wolverhampton Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 GODDARD, EDWARD, West Chapel st, Mayfair High Court Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 HAYMAN, JOHN GEORGE, Cardiff, Grocer Cardiff Pet May 11 Ord June 9
 HEGINDOTTON, EMMA, Stalybridge, Undertaker Ashton under Lyne Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 HOLMES, MARY ANN, Leominster, Cabinet Maker Leominster Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 HOYLE, ARTHUR, Normanton, Fruiterer Wakefield Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 HUGHES, CHRISTOPHER COOKE, Walsall, Pattern Maker Walsall Pet June 2 Ord June 2
 IRELAND, ROBERT, and WILLIAM BELL, Blackburn, Leather Dealers Blackburn Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 LEE, WILLIAM HENRY, Stockport, Drysalter Stockport Pet May 31 Ord June 10
 MACINTYRE, ARCHIBALD, Worthing, Articled Clerk Brighton Ord May 27
 MARTIN, Captain ERNEST STANLEY, New Broad st, Company Promoter High Court Pet May 19 Ord June 11
 MERTON, J S, St. Martin's st, Leicester sq, Solicitor High Court Pet March 17 Ord June 11
 MOORE, THOMAS, Chelsea, Ironmonger High Court Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 MORRIS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer Northampton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 MORRIS, GEORGE, Newmarket, Steeplechase Jockey Cambridge Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 NEWICK, ALFRED, Bedminster, Oilman Bristol Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 NICKOLS, R P, Putney Wandsworth Pet May 20 Ord June 9
 NORMANTON, WILLIAM, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks, Greengrocer Halifax Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 PERKINS, EDWIN BENJAMIN, South Tottenham, Commercial Clerk Edmonton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 POTTER, ERNEST, Bradford, Wool Merchant Bradford Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 RAWWELL, THOMAS, Chorley, Lancs, Wheelwright Bolton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 SAUNDERS, WILLIAM, Tonbridge, Builder Tonbridge Wells Pet May 26 Ord June 9
 SMITH, JOHN ANSTY, Stapleton, Bristol Bristol Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 STEEDMAN, RACHEL, Southwark High Court Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 STERRY, THOMAS JAMES, Harwich, Essex, Grocer Colchester Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 STOCK, CHARLES, Pontycymer, Glam Cardiff Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 TALBOT, EDWARD CHARLES, Forest Hill, Kent Greenvich Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 WAGO, THOMAS, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Coal Miner Nottingham Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 WARREN, GEORGE HENRY, Newport Pagnell, Bucks, Butcher Northampton Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 WEBSTER, JAMES, Blackburn Blackburn Pet May 23 Ord June 8
 WILKINSON, DANIEL, Kingston upon Hull, Cowkeeper Kingston upon Hull Pet June 10 Ord June 10

FIRST MEETINGS.

ADAMS, WILLIAM HENRY, Madeley, Salop, Butcher June 21 at 11.30 Off Rec, 42, St John's hill, Shrewsbury
 ARMSTRONG, STEPHEN, Bakewell, Derby, Grocer June 22 at 11 Off Rec, 40, St Mary's gate, Derby
 BAKER, ERNEST EDWARD, Plymouth, Insurance Agent June 21 at 11.30 6, Athenaeum ter, Plymouth
 BAKER, HENRY, Brook, I of W June 23 at 11.30 19, Quay st, Newport, I of W

BERSLEY, WILLIAM, Wapenham, Northampton, Auctioneer June 22 at 12.30 County Court bldgs, Sheep st, Northampton
 BENNETT, HENRY JAMES, Camborne, Cornwall, Farmer June 25 at 12 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro
 BLANCHETT, WILLIAM ERNEST, Wilton, Wilts, Cycle Dealer June 22 at 12 Off Rec, City Chambers, Endless st, Salisbury
 BOND, HERBERT EDGAR, Rushden, Northampton, Coach-builder June 22 at 1 County Court bldgs, Sheep st, Northampton
 BRETTON, EDWIN, Margate, Newsagent's Manager June 23 at 9.15 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 BROOKS, AUGUSTUS NOBLE, Brislington, Somerset, Butcher June 22 at 12.30 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
 CARPENTER, JAMES CLEVELLEY, Cardiff June 23 at 11 Off Rec, 29, Queen st, Cardiff
 CHALCRAFT, JAMES, Shanklin, I W, Greengrocer June 23 at 11 19, Quay st, Newport, I W
 COHEN, DAVID, Birmingham, Tailor June 23 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
 CORY, WALTER BRYANT, Truro, Corn Merchant June 25 at 2 Off Rec, Boscawen st, Truro
 COX, CHARLES SAMUEL, and EDWARD CAMPBELL, St Mary Axe, General Merchants June 24 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 DOWELL, JAMES, Prestatyn, Flint, Builder June 21 at 3.45 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
 DRINGBRIER, ERNEST, Dover, Fishmonger June 25 at 12 Off Rec, 73, Castle st, Canterbury
 DURCAN, ROBERT, Madeley, Salop, Accountant July 6 at 12.30 County Court Office, Madeley
 FINLAY, JOHN ROBERT, Bishop Auckland, General Dealer June 23 at 3 Off Rec, 25, John st, Sunderland
 GOMERALL, MAURICE, Hunslet, Fish Salesman June 22 at 11 Off Rec, 22, Park row, Leeds
 GRAINGER, GEORGE GIBSON, Heskett New Market, Cumberland, Innkeeper June 22 at 1 Off Rec, 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
 GREENE, JAMES WINSON, Birkenhead, Furniture Dealer June 24 at 12 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 GRIFFITH, THOMAS LIAISON, Anglesey, Contractor June 22 at 12.15 Ship Hotel, Bangor
 HARRISON, HENRY ROBERT, Ipswich, Upholsterer June 24 at 2 Off Rec, 35, Princes st, Ipswich
 HIGGS, ELIZABETH, Clifton, Bristol June 22 at 12 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
 HILYARD, ARTHUR, Luton, Straw Hat Manufacturer June 24 at 11 Chamber of Commerce bldgs, 53, George st, Luton
 HOLMES, MARY ANN, Leominster, Cabinet Maker June 23 at 10 4, Corn sq, Leominster
 HULSE, HENRY, Winsford, Cheshire, Builder June 24 at 11 Royal Hotel, Crewe
 KEYSSELL, THOMAS, Clapham Junction, Grocer June 21 at 11.30 24, Railway approach, London Bridge
 KING, ALFRED, and ALBERT JOHN WETTERELL, East Stour, Dorsets, Millers, 46 June 21 at 1 Off Rec, City chambers, Endless st, Salisbury
 LEATHERHEAD, GEORGE PENNING, Merton, Surrey, Journalist June 21 at 12.30 24, Railway app, London Edge
 LOGAN, JAMES, Pokesdown, Hants July 13 at 11 Antelope Hotel, Poole
 MARTIN, Captain ERNEST STANLEY, Broad st av, Company Promoter June 22 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MATTHEWS, ALFRED GIBSON, Watbourne, Hants, Draper's Assistant July 13 at 10.30 Antelope Hotel, Poole
 MATTHEWS, HERBERT, Pokesdown, Hants July 13 at 11.30 Antelope Hotel, Poole
 MERTON, J S, Martin's st, Leicester sq, Solicitor June 21 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MOORE, THOMAS, Chelsea, Ironmonger June 21 at 12 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 MORRIS, GEORGE, Newmarket, Steeplechase Jockey June 22 at 10 Off Rec, 5, Petty Cur, Cambridge
 NORMANTON, WILLIAM, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks, Greengrocer June 27 at 11 Off Rec, Townhall chambers, Halifax
 OATES, WILLIAM, Strand June 21 at 11 Bankruptcy bldgs, Carey st
 OSTLER, ALFRED GEORGE, Upper Parkstone, Dorsets Fruiterer July 13 at 10 Antelope Hotel, Poole
 PARR, THOMAS, Little Budworth, nr Tarporley, Licensed Victualler June 24 at 12 Royal Hotel, Crewe
 PORTER, FREDERICK CHARLES, Deptford, Public house Manager June 21 at 2.30 24, Railway app, London Bridge
 RAWWELL, THOMAS, Chorley, Wheelwright June 23 at 11 16, Wood st, Bolton
 REEVE, ALFRED, King's Heath, Birmingham, Corn Merchant June 22 at 12 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
 SADLER, JOHN, Birkenhead, Sewing Machine Dealer June 22 at 3 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 SMITH, JOHN ANSTY, Stapleton, Bristol June 22 at 1 Off Rec, Baldwin st, Bristol
 STONEHAM, JOHN DURANT, Plymouth, Butcher June 21 at 11 6, Athenaeum ter, Plymouth
 STRUT, CHARLES GEORGE, Nottingham, Cattle Dealer June 21 at 12 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
 SUMNERHILL, THOMAS HENRY, Rhyl, Flint, Surgeon June 21 at 3 Crypt chambers, Eastgate row, Chester
 THOMAS, JOHN, Shurdington, nr Cheltenham, Beehouse Keeper June 30 at 11 County Court bldgs, Cheltenham
 THONGER, GILBERT, Harborne, Staffs, Chemist June 22 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham
 THORP, JOSEPH HENRY, Shelley, York, Journeyman Tailor June 22 at 11 Off Rec, 19, John William st, Huddersfield
 WEBSTER, MATTHEW HENRY, Pudsey, Yorks, Topmaker June 22 at 11 Off Rec, 31, Manor row, Bradford
 WILLIAMS, FRANK, Birmingham, Builder June 24 at 11 174, Corporation st, Birmingham

ADJUDICATIONS.

ALLAN, HENRY, Shepperton, Commission Agent High Court Pet May 10 Ord June 11

ASTHON, THOMAS ARTHUR, Longton, China Merchant Stoke upon Trent Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 BAKER, ERNEST EDWARD, Plymouth, Insurance Agent Plymouth Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 BARNES, JOHN, Sheffield, Cattle Dealer Sheffield Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 COX, CHARLES SAMUEL, and EDWARD CAMPBELL, St. Mary Axe, General Merchants High Court Pet June 1 Ord June 10
 CROMPTON, MOSES, Winton, Bournemouth, Fried Fish Merchant Portsmouth Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 DAVIES, JACOB, Pontypridd, Quarryman Pontypridd Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 DARRIE, THOMAS, Bridgend, Glam, Tailor Cardiff Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 DUDMAN, ABRAHAM, Midhurst, Sussex, Farmer Brighton Pet June 8 Ord June 10
 ENGLAND, THOMAS HAIGH, Slithwaite, nr Huddersfield, Commercial Traveller Huddersfield Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 ENGLAND, LUCY, Holt, Wilts Bath Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 ESKINER, ALFRED MAR STUART, Piccadilly High Court Pet May 1 Ord June 11
 ESKINER, JAMES FRANCIS HARRY ST CLAIR, EARL OF ROSLYNS, St James's sq High Court Pet Nov 11 Ord June 8
 FLAYELL, ALBERT HENRY, Halesowen, nr Worcester Stourbridge Pet June 7 Ord June 7
 FUSSELL, GEORGE WILLIAM, Weymouth, Draper Dorchester Pet June 9 Ord June 10
 GIBBER, E MILBORD, Farnborough High Court Pet May 31 Ord June 10
 GODDARD, EDWARD, West Chapel st, Mayfair High Court Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 GREENE, JAMES WINSON, Birkenhead, Furniture Dealer Birkenhead Pet June 7 Ord June 9
 GREEN, ALEXANDER, Newton, Manchester Manchester Ord June 11
 HART, SHERIDAN COLBURN, and CHARLES EDWARD FOWLER, Holland Park av, Auctioneers High Court Pet Feb 17 Ord June 10
 HEGINDOTTON, EMMA, Stalybridge, Chester, Undertaker Ashton under Lyne Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 HERZBERG, EDWARD, Lombard st, Merchant High Court Pet Jan 10 Ord June 8
 HILYARD, ARTHUR, Luton, Bedford, Straw Hat Manufacturer Luton Pet June 4 Ord June 11
 HOYLE, ARTHUR, Normanton, Yorks, Fruiterer Wakefield Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 IRELAND, ROBERT, and WILLIAM BELL, Blackburn, Leathers Dealers Blackburn Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 JONES, ALBERT EDWARD, Huddersfield, Pawnbroker Huddersfield Pet June 6 Ord June 7
 JONES, THOMAS, Oakham, nr Dudley Dudley Pet May 18 Ord June 9
 JORDAN, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Strood, Kent, Builder Rochester Pet May 25 Ord June 10
 KUPPENHAGEN, LEON, Queen st, Cheapside, Tobaccoist High Court Pet May 25 Ord June 11
 LEWIS, WILLIAM, Swansea, Club Manager Swansea Pet June 6 Ord June 8
 MARTIN, WALTER TOUT, Gt Winchester st High Court Pet May 5 Ord June 8
 MARTIN, WILLIAM HENRY, Wallis down, Dorset, Baker Poole Pet May 16 Ord June 10
 MORRIS, FREDERICK GEORGE, Northampton, Boot Manufacturer Northampton Pet June 7 Ord June 10
 MORRIS, GEORGE, Newmarket, Steeplechase Jockey Cambridge Pet June 10 Ord June 11
 NORMANTON, WILLIAM, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks, Greengrocer Halifax Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 OATES, WILLIAM, East Dulwich High Court Pet May 18 Ord June 10
 PERKINS, EDWIN BENJAMIN, South Tottenham, Commercial Clerk Edmonton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 PIPER, GEORGE, Kensington, Wardrobe Dealer High Court Pet May 3 Ord June 9
 POTTER, ERNEST, Bradford, Wool Merchant Bradford Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 RAMSAY, WILLIAM DAVID, Westbourne pk High Court Pet April 19 Ord June 11
 RAWWELL, THOMAS, Chorley, Lancs, Wheelwright Bolton Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 STERRY, RACHEL, Southwark, Egg Dealer High Court Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 STERRY, THOMAS JAMES, Harwich, Essex, Grocer Colchester Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 STOCK, CHARLES, Pontycymer, Glam Cardiff Pet June 9 Ord June 9
 THONGER, GILBERT, Harborne, Staffs, Chemist Birmingham Pet May 9 Ord June 11
 VON MEIER, EMIL FRIEDRICH JULIUS HONDART ALEXANDER, Finchley, Warehouseman High Court Pet May 23 Ord June 10
 WAGO, THOMAS, Hucknall Torkard, Notts, Coal Miner Nottingham Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 WARREN, GEORGE HENRY, Newport Pagnell, Bucks, Butcher Northampton Pet June 11 Ord June 11
 WEBSTER, JAMES, Blackburn Blackburn Pet May 23 Ord June 8
 WILKINSON, DANIEL, Kingston upon Hull, Cowkeeper Kingston upon Hull Pet June 10 Ord June 10
 WOMACE, GEORGE, Grimsthorpe, nr Barnsley, Farmer Barnsley Pet May 2 Ord June 9

Subscription, PAYABLE IN ADVANCE, which includes Indexes, Digests, Statutes, and Postage, 52s. WEEKLY REPORTER, in wrapper, 26s.; by Post, 28s. SOLICITORS' JOURNAL, 26s.; by Post, 28s. Volumes bound at the office—cloth, 2s. 9d., half law calf, 5s. 6d.

Merchant
 10
 nce Agent
 efield Pet
 , St. Mary
 et June 1
 Fried Fish
 June 9
 rpridd Pet
 Cardiff Pet
 r Brighton
 uddersfield,
 t June 10
 ne 10 Ord
 High Court
 , EARL OF
 Nov 11 Ord
 Worcester
 aper Dor-
 rt Pet Mar
 High Court
 ure Dealer
 Manchester
 and FOWLES,
 rt Pet Feb
 Undertaker
 e 10
 High Court
 Hat Manu-
 Wakefield
 urn, Leather
 e 9
 Pawnbroker
 Pet May 18
 der Roches-
 Tobaccoist
 wansen Pet
 High Court
 oract, Baker
 Boot Manu-
 June 10
 ckey Cam-
 rks, Green-
 0
 Pet May 18
 , Commercial
 9
 Dealer High
 nt Bradford
 High Court
 ight Bolton
 High Court
 Grocer Oct-
 ff Pet June
 et Birming-
 DAET ALEX-
 Court Pet
 Coal Mine
 nell, Bucke
 d June 11
 Pet May 18
 Cowkeeper
 June 10
 ley, Farmer

which is
 and Post-
 n wrapper,
 JOURNAL,
 und at the
 5s. 6d.